DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 254 PS 006 469

AUTHOR	Ratliff, Patricia; Berryman, Pauline
TITLE	Organizing to Coordinate Child Care Services. (With an Appendix) The Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association: Early History.
INSTITUTION	Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	128p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., 1401 K Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20005 ($1.75)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Care Centers; Community Involvement; *Guides; Management; *Organization; Parent Participation; Preschool Programs; *Program Coordination; Program Planning; Public Relations

ABSTRACT

Systems of coordinating child care services are analyzed as a guide to organizing. Federal Community Child Care (4-C) are the focus of the analysis. In Part I, evolution of coordination, an initial steering committee is followed through its various phases of expansion--initial impetus, visibility, staffing patterns, parent involvement, community involvement. In Part II, coordination accomplishments, what coordination groups can actually accomplish, what some already have accomplished, is discussed in terms of staff training, family day care, parent education, information, expansions, supportive services. In Part III, the problems of establishing visibility, credibility and workability are examined. Part IV focuses on two pervasive problems in all coordination programs at all levels--communication and consumer input. Appended are a list of groups contacted in the course of this research, a resource bibliography, and a history of the Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association. (Author/KM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 076254

Organizing to Coordinate Child Care Services

Patricia Ratliff

photo by Michael Sullivan

with an appendix

The Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association: Early History

by

Pauline Berryman

PS 006769

Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1973

ED 076254

ORGANIZING TO COORDINATE CHILD CARE SERVICES

by Patricia Ratliff

with an Appendix:

The Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association: Early History

by Pauline Berryman

PS 03469

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Day Care & Child Development Council of America, Inc.
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

Copyright 1973 by

The Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.
1401 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Preface

Introduction

Part I: Evolution of Coordination

- Initial Impetus
- Visibility
- Staffing Patterns
- Parent Involvement
- Community Involvement

Part II: Coordination Accomplishments

- Staff Training
- Family Day Care
- Parent Education
- Information
- Expansions
- Supportive Services

Part III: Credibility Problems

Part IV: Conclusions/Recommendations

Research Contacts

Appendix:

- The Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association: Early History

Resource Bibliography

PREFACE

Ms. Ratliff is a single parent with two preschool daughters in one of California's Children's Centers. She is a welfare recipient and a full time student at the University of California. Prior to the birth of her second daughter she returned to college to get her teaching credential. At that time she confronted the problems of finding day care for a not-quite-two-year-old and later an infant of 6 months in order to continue her education, become employed and break the welfare cycle. Realizing the importance of the day care movement in this country, she has shifted her focus from secondary education to early childhood development and is pursuing training in the administration of child care facilities and programs. She and her children traveled to Washington, D. C. this past summer to research the development of child care coordinating programs and subsequently to write this article. Since she represents her community to the 4-C organization developing in her county she brings to this article the practical experiences of her committee work as well as the expertise gained from researching the field.

INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper we will be looking at coordination systems from several points of view. You, the reader, are most likely already involved in the day care situation and have positive attitudes about its possible growth. So do I. You may be considering how best to mobilize the resources of your community on behalf of child care. So am I. You may be involved in an already established effort to effect coordination and are wondering: Where do we go from here? I wonder too. And with these things in common perhaps those of you who are the providers, the professionals, the agencies, will here have an opportunity to tune in on us: the parent/consumers. Both of us know how readily professionals can provide information on what parents need for their children, but you need to be aware of how important it is to provide for parents the opportunity to voice what we want and further to learn why we need what you believe we need.

After several weeks of immersing myself in the task of defining, identifying and evaluating child care coordinating mechanisms, I have come to the conclusion that we have to admit that the federal Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C) program is inextricably interwined with the concept of coordination throughout the country and is far and away the most visible form to ferret out when trying to observe

the beast. For that reason we will be focusing mainly on 4-C groups. But we must, at the outset, emphasize that not all coordination efforts are 4-C efforts and even, sadly, that not all 4-C efforts are coordination efforts. The one non 4-C community coordination group included here is the Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association. Because of its visibility in its own community it has been quite successful in coordination and planning and for that reason I included it in my research.

Within this paper we will view coordination groups at several points in their development. In Part I we will follow the initial steering committee through its various phases of expansion. The focus will be (1) on common patterns of types of people involved in establishing an ad hoc steering-committee-citizen-task-force-group; (2) on the kinds of people who will become involved in the group as it consciously tries to expand, especially the parents; (3) on the kinds of situations encountered when staffing the organization; (4) on the techniques used to involve and educate more parents; (5) on the various and sundry projects some groups have used to enhance their public relations in the community to establish visibility and credibility, and ultimately on the kinds and levels of community involvement which reach out beyond those of us already interested in child care and its advocacy.

In Part II we will approach the real "nitty gritty" of the program: what coordination groups can actually accomplish, what they have already accomplished in some communities. Throughout the country we will look at interpretations of coordination that include staff training, family day care homes, parent education projects, information systems and planning for expansion of facilities and of supportive services. Time and again we see "community resource mobilization" and "child care" interpreted in their broadest possible meanings. Community after community has been excitingly creative in using the umbrella of the coordinating organization to reach out and redefine the materials and concepts that can be provided for the enrichment of childhood.

In Part III we will take a good hard look at the problems of establishing visibility, credibility and workability. We will try to focus on the interrelated sequences of developing each of these areas.

Part IV focuses on two pervasive, recurrent problems which seem to be inherent in all coordination programs at all levels: communication and consumer input. At this time groups everywhere have only scanty information about what other community and statewide coordination organizations are attempting and accomplishing for children. We seem to be reinventing the wheel, each group in its own way, only to end up spinning those wheels. Communication networks within

each Federal Region and a nationwide system of information flow is imperative if we are going to stop duplicating energy and start picking each other's brains. Over and above that we must come up with more than a lip-service commitment to the concept of parent/consumer involvement. This has to include education. We wouldn't expect a carpenter to build a cabinet without his tools and you can't expect parents to participate in task-oriented committees and policy making boards without helping us learn the processes through which those committees and boards operate. Beyond that we have to address ourselves and the whole day care movement to the massive demands on time and energy that parenthood implies, particularly upon the working parent and most acutely on the single working parent. If we are to focus on upgrading the quality of family life in this country and if we are capable of envisioning the availability of child care as integral to that goal, then we must advocate that the labor-business-industry sector in particular and society as a whole establish a priority for creating time for parents to become better parents-fathers as well as mothers. This means available time to work in the day care facility and also within the structure of the decision making bodies which control the individual centers, as well as within the groups that coordinate and plan the growth of child care facilities and services throughout the community. Why is it that only company executives are involved

in community projects? Why aren't all employees entitled to community service leaves of absence?

I have appended to this paper two areas for your further research:

(1) The names and addresses of those people I contacted in each of the communities researched so that you can also contact them for further, more specific information which your group may want to focus on. In all cases these respondents have been most agreeable and helpful in my research. Please remember, however, that their programs have resource difficulties similar to yours and that ferreting out information and preparing it for mailing takes staff time and energy and that duplication and mailing of written materials is expensive.

(2) A bibliography of the literature I have read (and sometimes reread) in preparation for writing this paper. Very little of it was directly quoted or included in this paper simply because the field information tells us so much more about "where it's at" than literature which more frequently tells us where it might have come from. The two, however (field information and the literature), are an integral source of information to be used as a tool for coordinating and planning for child care in your community.

Part I: THE EVOLUTION OF COORDINATION GROUPS

Child care has become a priority for our present culture. The reasons for this focus are as diverse as the kinds of child care offered. Government sees child care as an agent for shifting mothers off the welfare roles and into jobs. Industry sees child care as a fringe benefit to recruit mothers and to stabilize the output of those already employed. Women's Liberation groups see child care a expanding the mother's horizons. Communities see child care as a possible source of additional federal monies. Institutions of higher learning see it as a source of training and research monies. Parents not needing child care see it as an institution taking over the role of the family. And families who do need child care see it as essential to their whole livelihood.

But far and above all of these visions there are those of us who view child care as providing the child a rich array of social experiences with other children as well as with adults while pursuing basic physical and intellectual developmental objectives. Whether this environment is supplemental, complementary or a replacement to the child's home depends totally on individual family needs. Those positive optimists of us who view child care this way also see the preventive diagnostic values inherent in this situation and how imperative these factors are, particularly for that segment of our society which

of necessity, uses this service at this time: the low- and marginal-income families. Of course there are those even more positive and optimistic who envision child care as the initial educational environment for the child, the opportunity to help the child approach and step over the threshold from a visual/verbal perceptual world into the world of symbols and complex, even abstract, learning situations.

For these kinds of reasons, clusters of positive thinkers throughout the country have been getting together in their communities to form steering committees and ad hoc groups to begin the almost insurmountable task of mobilizing resources available within their communities to upgrade the quality of care that already exists; to provide for the expansion of facilities and services in as coherent a manner as possible given the limitations of manpower and materials which all community-initiated efforts face. The most visible of these groups are those which fit into the federal model of Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C) programs, simply because the Office of Child Development under the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in Washington has information from and about all of these programs. But, again, coordination of efforts and resources for child care at the community level is not confined to following the process set forth in the 4-C manuals.

Several coordinating groups have successfully facilitated the establishment of staff training programs, created resource and information referral systems accessible to both providers of child care services and users or potential users of child care, created unified voices for procuring funds for community-wide use and even encouraged and facilitated an expansion of the types of programs available (e.g. 24-hour care, sick child care). And beyond these accomplishments there are some exemplary groups which have provided opportunities perhaps not even envisioned by those who originally demanded the establishment of coordination mechanisms.

Within the scope of this paper we will be looking at coordination groups from the point of view of their makeup and character, how they evolved from stage to stage in their growth from a group of interested dedicated citizens to an organization with hired staff to an on-going permanent body of interested dedicated citizens. We will be looking at how they successfully mobilized the resources within their reach to maximize the co-ordination and planning they early dreamed of. We will be looking at some isolated, highly individualized projects that sprang perhaps as much from a need within the community as from one member's inspiration. But primarily we will be focusing on the overriding need of any community group mobilized to create, coordinate and plan child care facilities and service and that need is advocacy.

It seems that no matter how totally committed or well organized a group may be, to realize any success at all, their enthusiasm and dedication must spread throughout their community; it must be contagious and all-encompasing. Unless the steering committee or ad hoc group or whatever form the initial group takes becomes an active and successful advocate at the community level for the concept of child care, there is very little hope that any of their dreams no matter how well planned, or co-ordinated, staffed, or funded - will never become realities.

Initial Impetus

Community coordination of child care didn't just pop out of nowhere, nor did it come to life from the dictum of the federal government. In several large metropolitan areas the idea had piggy-backed itself on to some sort of community planning mechanism already in existence. Even where this had not already happened, the seeds of discontent had drawn together many people in many communities to grumble about the sparsity of day care facilities and the low quality of many of those that were available. Almost inevitably, the people who rallied around the cause of more and better child care came from similar parts of our society.

We could almost draw a composite of the woman who took on child care as her cause. Over thirty, her children usually already in school, her need for day care minimal (her memory of that need, however, still sharp). Often she has a college degree, a professional job, sometimes a community position on the school board, planning commission or city council. Almost always she volunteers time in the Junior League, the League of Women Voters, the American Association of University Women, the National Council of Jewish Women, in her Church group or several other active civic-minded groups or combinations of many. From these associations she comes to the cause of child care with an active, long standing knowledge of community

involvement, and committee work, as well as the awareness that politics is the art of the possible.* She is usually married to a doctor, lawyer or corporate executive who is usually also active in community groups. So she, and others like her with access to these portions of the community decision making structure, come together. They pull in the appropriate people from the appropriate social agencies (Welfare, Family Planning and Counseling, Public Health, Community Action Programs, etc.) and recruit parents, usually Head Start people, into the project to become the community's primary voice for children. Often they envision child advocacy as the primary function of the community coordinating group for child care. They define child advocacy in its broadest possible context. They see the home as integral to the child and the day care facility (be it licensed home day care, group day care or even the cooperative play school) as that extension of the child's environment outside his own home most in need of monitoring in order to provide optimal developmental care for all children.

This early group, most generally called the steering committee, holds regular meetings and sets up subcommittees to draft a funding proposal and job descriptions, write by-laws, prepare articles of incorporation and other essential tasks. Also, they establish a public relations committee and a personnel committee (an outgrowth of the group that wrote the job des-

---

* Prescott, E., Millich and Jones, The "Politics" of Day Care, Vol. I, NAEYC, Washington, D.C., 1972

criptions). These committee machinations require a political expertise which often only people with this kind of background and enough volunteer experiences and time can bring to the situation.

One such woman is Pauline Berryman of Minneapolis who was instrumental in developing the Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association. The story of her involvement in that movement and her view of its outcome is so unique that I include it as she wrote it in an appendix.

Visibility

Getting a group together as advocates for children is a relatively simple task compared with keeping that group together, sustaining those original enthusiasms, implementing some of those ideas to generate some feelings of accomplishment, and most important, expanding that group. And to expand the group we can't just rely on recruiting more parents, providers, and agency representatives. We've got to set our heads to the peripheral part of the community, even the hard core apathetic portions of our communities. As in all causes it is well and fine to sit around a table with a group of crones lamenting the sad state of affairs, creating and planning new alternatives and even now and then implementing a dream or two. But to really get the show on the road we have to view community resources in a much broader perspective than that of social agencies obviously related to child care.

At this juncture the coordinating group has got to face the challenge of visibility. It's fine to effect changes. People affected by those changes are aware of it and, hopefully, appreciative. But what about the rest of the community, those who don't have children needing child care, those industries whose women employees have been able to fend for themselves when it comes to finding child care arrangements, those colleges who still want to believe that coeds are starry-eyed

cheerleaders. Until we make ourselves visible we have little access to these and other resources within our communities.

Several groups have printed attractive fact sheets that explain the goals and objectives of the coordinating group, describe the composition of its membership and even advise the reader where he might fit in. Springfield (Massachusetts) 4-C typed and stenciled theirs on legal sized sheets folded in thirds. Atlanta 4-C had theirs printed and folded in half, the size of a business envelope, so it can be mailed. Both groups circulate theirs to medical offices, child care facilities, schools and PTA groups, community bulletin boards, markets and shopping plazas, laundromats—anywhere that people might be looking for information. Also they have them available at in-service training sessions for day care staff, community college and university programs, high school career days, and any workshop sessions in any way remotely related to children and families.

In Waco, Texas, the Greater Waco McLennan County 4-C has written a form letter to be used in recruiting parents. It focuses on the relevance of the 4-C group to the parents' desires and needs for their child. Another letter is geared toward agency personnel defining 4-C objectives and its funding situation; another is to be sent to possible interested citizens defining how they too might participate.

Within the framework of the child care network several coordination groups have developed lending systems for toys, equipment, books, (both for children and resource books for staff). Through purchase agreement it is possible to buy food and supplies for day care centers and homes at lower prices. In (Georgia) the 4-C has created what is called a Clothes Closet. Several sources of used and usable clothing have been identified and regularly contribute to a central collection place where it is available to needy families. This includes clothes for adults, children and infants.

At one point or another almost all groups have been able to use their local newspaper to voice the deplorable state of child care in their community, to identify the coordination organization and its intent, and often to publicize activities of the group. Missoula (Montana) used a full page Sunday supplement for an article entitled: "What's So Important About Day Care?" including pictures. Atlanta covered half an editorial page with "Little Girl Locked in Bedroom: Day Care Lacking for Preschoolers" as the lead article around a cartoon depicting a woman representing 700,000 licensed day-care centers (nationwide) next to a toddler four times her size indicating the children of 11½ million working mothers. Escanaba (Michigan) circulated a press release to explain federal recognition of their Tri-County 4-C group and what

its activities and goals are. Newspapers have also been used to air problems centered around children as in the case of Springfield (Massachusetts) and their article about drug abused newborns, "Addict Babies Get No Chance."

Access to local radio talk shows and TV public information spots has been sporadic but successful when available. Westchester County (New York) has developed a slide presentation emphasizing that there are parts of the county beyond Scarsdale where poverty is rampant and child care is essential. It shows what a quality day care facility can look like and tells what it should include. The dialogue accompanying those slides states at one point:

> Even the best of day care centers have problems. They are extensive and include a shortage of personnel, inadequate facilities, inadequate professional training and, most importantly, the root of all the problems, inadequate funding.

Many groups have utilized workshops and conferences for public relations purposes as well as staff training or parent education. Missoula (Montana) last year held its first annual conference on Early Childhood Education which received wide coverage. Then during the "Week of the Young Child" in May, the 4-C group publicized day care centers which would be open to the public and added a number to call to arrange for transportation. Waco (Texas) has developed a program called Parent's Problem Clinic which has included an appearance and

discussion with Dr. Haim Ginott of Between Parent and Child fame.

Publicity seems to be not where you find it but where you make it. And publicity is the threshold to visibility. Any activities and achievements which have been made and are being made for children need to be publicized beyond those who are already interested. If you intend to coordinate your community for child care, if you ever expect to mobilize the resources of that community, then you have to let that community know that you exist, that you are well organized, that you are recognized within your field and that you need their support.

Staffing Patterns

Once the steering committee gets the ball rolling and things are beginning to shape up, the pinch to hire staff becomes acute. Simply sending meeting notices out, getting the committee and subcommittee minutes typed and mailed to the members, duplicating drafts of proposals, by-laws, etc., running off an attractive fact sheet/flyer, making child care and refreshment arrangements for the meetings all multiply exponentially as the size of the committee expands and enthusiasm mounts. Volunteer time for these tasks does not expand and people with access to duplicating equipment through their jobs begin to dwindle as the needs increase. It is feasible to run a coordination effort on pooled labor and equipment provided by agencies involved. The detrimental factor is that tasks above and beyond the work plan, i.e. the inevitable crises, must either go begging or the smooth administration of the program falls by the wayside while the crises are properly attended to.

When it comes down to the nitty gritty of it, a full time or at least part time paid staff consisting of a program administrator and a secretary are essential to true expansion of the coordination program. Fortunately, when the steering committee has come to this conclusion, they have also usually expanded to include a significant number of parent/consumers

and interested citizens. This coalition has jelled to form a smooth running task-oriented group that has been capable of cranking out a funding proposal, by-laws and oftentimes articles of incorporation. So from this perspective and with this kind of togetherness in communication, the task of setting up a personnel committee (expanded from the job description subcommittee) can be readily accomplished and it should be capable of coming up with concrete, acceptable results in employing the kind of staff that best reflects the goals and objectives of the body.

At this point the body is faced with the alternatives in experience backgrounds that can be crucial to the future of the whole coordination effort. Even well thought-out and well written job descriptions can't provide specific guidelines for making those ultimate decisions. Because all concerned have the best interests of the children and families in mind, experience in early childhood education sounds good. Because professionals on the committee from agencies know that running an operation with little or no capital requires real expertise in administration, they tend to campaign for education and experience in business administration. Because providers are aware of the complexity of bureaucracies of the local social services mechanism, they feel that someone in social welfare with experience in social case work would be ideal.

Obviously it would be optimal to hire a combination of everyone's desires: a child care center director with a Masters in Social Work and one in Business Administration as well as a couple of years experience "on the floor" with the children. But what is being overlooked, and what is absolutely essential to the position of Program Administrator/Executive Director/Day Care Coordinator or whatever you title that position, is a community organizer. Although there are only a few universities offering the Masters in Social Welfare with emphasis on community organization, there are at the same time several people right in your own community who have been doing it for quite a while. The key is to find the right community organizer from within your community, the one who can be (or maybe already is) recruited as an advocate for the needs of children and families.

In answer to a letter requesting information for this project, Shirley Oczus, chairman of the Menominee-Delta-Schoolcraft 4C in Escanaba (Michigan) described the scope of that job this way:

> 4C is <u>NOT</u> an 8 to 5 job. It requires that little bit of extra effort, the willingness to "try anything once", the ability to organize, plan, develop strategy and negotiate. We try to operate on the premise that there are a lot of concerned people out there and it just takes one person who is willing to do the work to start the ball rolling. Many of the problems that cause programs and agencies to falter and even stagnate can be resolved by openness and frank discussions of problems. Most administrators are so involved

> in the mechanics of their programs that they have no time to see what actually is going on out in the field. They must rely on reports from their assistants who also may not have the time to do real observation of field activities. It is of urgent necessity that administrators meet with their clientele on neutral ground where discussions can be held, problems resolved, guidelines explained, and changes planned where possible.

Too often coordinating groups, exhausted from their initial efforts, want to dump the whole shootin' match onto an expert, someone who knows what to do next, someone who can keep the ball rolling and effect all those beautiful, idealistic, revolutionary changes for children and families. When this happens the group soon learns two things: (1) not all of those grand ideas can be implemented immediately or even within the logical, flexible timetable so carefully worked out, and (2) the committee no longer has a great deal of "say so" in what happens. The rationale behind hiring a community organizer is to have someone to keep on expanding the coordinating committee out into the community - beyond those of us who already care about children, into labor, business and industry, into the civic service groups, the social agencies, higher education — the whole community. Incorporating the community into a body that cares about its children has got to be the primary concern of a community coordinating child care mechanism. The office can be run by an administrative assistant with business training (or in the process of getting it); curriculum standards can be upgraded by consulting with

an educational coordinator; supplemental social services can be coordinated by a social worker tuned in and turned on to child care. But if we really want to insist on community coordinated, community controlled, parent involved child care, community organization aimed at child advocacy must take precedence over all other concerns. Before we develop new programs, before we upgrade existing programs, before we plan expansion, we have to be assured that it is what we want done and in the way we want it done. The only assurances we have are in the care with which we write our job descriptions, by-laws, articles of incorporation, etc. and in the care with which we interview, screen and employ our staff to implement the changes we want. When it comes to what we need it is the MBA's, MSW's, child psychologist, educators, medical teams and nutritionist that we turn to and for that reason we must incorporate them into the program. Unless we can tell them what we want and they can tell us what we need, it is almost impossible to create any programs that would satisfy any of us.

Because of the sparsity of federal financial commitment, most coordinating groups have turned to in-kind staff time donations from already existent agencies affiliated, no matter how remotely, with child care. These services are not usually perpetual in nature. However, when federal funds do come through, they are usually available to match a local public share which in the past was interpreted as in-kind services.

Several programs (especially Portland, Oregon; Escanaba, Michigan; Missoula, Montana) have used these kinds of methods to establish staff and provide salaries for them. The question there is: What do you do if the director on loan is not really the kind of professional you need for your program? How do you get enough clout together to replace an administrator with a community organizer? Madison (Wisconsin) 4-C has been able to work this out by balancing off a director with a degree in Early Childhood Education with an executive board chairman who is in social welfare. Minneapolis has mobilized some parents to do community organizing. But groups have to be totally in control of the coordination movement to pull this off; they have to be completely in communication with all facets of the operation, in the office and out in the field. This seems like an ideal situation but it is unfortunately rarely possible, especially as early in the game as when the groups need to turn to staff employment.

Hiring the director is not the end of the process. We must be able to build on the staff in such a way that even the most dispensible of part time clerical help is tuned in to child care. When the time comes (that is, when the money arrives) to expand beyond the director and the secretary, the personnel committee must have already established a working alliance with the director that insures that new staff will function efficiently with and for the director and that they

will subsequently reflect the goals and objectives of the group. You just can't expect to raise the consciousness of the community to the needs of children and families until you have turned the staff on to these needs so that they can advocate them as well as you can. Job skills, experience and potential are all important to the operation of the program. But divorced from enthusiasm and commitment to the cause they don't give you your money's worth. To develop the best programs we must demand the professional's skills but also the volunteer's enthusiasm.

Parent Involvement

Perhaps one of the biggest stumbling blocks to the smooth development of coordination groups as cohesive units of task oriented, policy making, planning bodies is the lack of foresight within the initiating committee in their incorporation of parent consumers into their boards. Time and again the parents involved in the steering committee stages are parents already involved in some political aspect of child care, usually in the policy councils of the facilities they are using. These parents know how to participate within the confines of committee structure; they know how to conduct meetings of their own since most of them are officers on their own center boards; they know how to make themselves heard and how to effect the changes they want within larger groups. Sometimes just the simple knowledge of how to use parliamentary procedures and an understanding of how it can abuse the rights of the minority in favor of the power of the majority can be the key to operating within the committee structure and providing input into the decision making process.

It seems that when steering committees include parents these people already have access to this knowledge and are versant in these skills. The big problem comes when we new parent/consumers are recruited into the committee as representatives of minority and low-income groups. By and large

we have never had access to these "tools of the trade" called "politics" and our attendance at meetings often amounts to a token "guest appearance." We are present, we speak when spoken to, answer when asked and vote at the proper time, if given a vote. We rarely initiate motions, take part in discussions, uphold our own opinions (if we do speak) when the mainstream flows against us and are seldom able to effect changes that would affect the lives of our children or ourselves.

But this is a limitation of our abilities, not our capabilities. Given access to knowledge, skills and opportunities to develop some expertise within the framework of such a committee structure, we can become a functional portion of the coordinating body and can begin to make ourselves heard where we want to be heard, we can communicate what we want for our children.

In their summary report to the Day Care and Child Development Council, Lola P. and Donald C. Klein of the Mobile Field Team note in regard to parent involvement:

> Parent involvement at all levels of day care programming and policy development is spotty, to say the least, and, with few exceptions, we were greatly disappointed in what we found. Parents are "dragged" onto 4-C committees to meet requirements for one-third membership, but rarely is time taken to orient them and help them deal with the high-powered middle-class community and agency people on the committees. The latter groups themselves need orientation and training in order to become aware of the many ways in which their preconceptions and cultural biases prevent them from relating to and

> making use of parent resources. Committees are often blind to such simple matters as holding meetings at times and places appropriate for working people.
>
> The most active parents we found were college students in student day care cooperatives. In those few cases where parents have been successfully organized around a community program . . . they are active in decision making around such matters as hiring and firing of staff. However, power struggles and personal vendettas appear to influence these decisions.
>
> We believe that fiscal support for parent attendance at day care conferences and for participation in training programs, workshops and seminars should be built into every publicly supported day care effort.

The Kleins spent approximately 6 months touring the United States focusing on child care facilities, demonstration projects and coordination groups in an attempt to help the Council evaluate the possibilities of expanding into decentralized regional offices.

Where the steering committees have been able to see beyond the need for providing more day care facilities to the broader needs of the children and families of their community the largest strides have been taken. When, in the initial organizing period, the steering committee was able to foresee the scope of the social possibilities inherent in mobilizing their community around the central issue of children's needs, they were then capable of carrying out their hiring procedures with a mind to organizing their community as the first step toward mobilizing its resources.

Seeing the necessity for the maximum involvement of immediately affected people, the steering committee with foresight has proven capable of giving way to members of the community with perhaps less expertise but with more acute needs and sometimes even more enthusiasm. But the committees with the most realistic foresight have also been able to see the need for remaining involved and available to these new recruits. Unless there is a coalition of expertise, enthusiasm and necessity, coordinating groups die at that point in their evolution. They may still exist and meet regularly but few of their projects reach fruition and many of their attempts to expand are futile.

It is undoubtedly a preformed animosity which parents and interested citizens often have for professionals within the day care field which is most difficult to deal with. And it is the professionals who must anticipate this and react positively. It is prevalent among parents, particularly low-income parents, to accept that "teachers" know more about raising kids than they do, even if they don't believe this. And for this reason most parents come into any group with antiprofessional chips on their shoulders expressed as: "I don't know nothin' about child psychology but I know what's best for my kids." The professionals, be they teachers, Welfare Department case workers, County Day Care Coordinators or whatever, have got to be aware of this attitude and willing to

accept that, indeed, parents do know a lot about their own children which is inaccessible to the professional. Also the knowledge that professionals have access to in regard to child development, nutrition and family psychology is something inaccessible to parents and interested citizens unless a coalition can be created. Where professionals within the coordinating group structure can be aware of this situation, the first steps of coordination can begin. But the professionals must go one step further and produce the mechanism to bridge this conflict.

It is at this point that we need to take a look at parent involvement and all its ramifications, at least all of those we are aware of. The concept of parent involvement stems more recently from the Head Start program where parents create a Policy Committee to establish policy for each particular Head Start center. In some non-Head Start programs, parent groups totally control decision making including staff employment. Parent involvement also sometimes means parents working in the center with the children, sometimes as volunteers, sometimes as staff in training or as paid staff. Somehow it is easier to see that parents need training to work with groups of children than they need training to be involved in policy and decision making.

Head Start does have a training manual for parents on the Policy Committee but it does no explicitly encourage use of these

skills beyond the Committee meetings nor does it lend itself to use with other groups. To include parents and interested citizens in decision making groups and processes throughout the community they must be provided with the tools to handle those situations. Professionals, and specifically those in child care coordinating groups, must devise mechanisms and techniques for aiding these parents and citizens in learning about parliamentary procedure, committee structures, task forces, brainstorming, etc., and more importantly, how to use these tools to be heard where they need to be heard and to implement action to achieve their needs. Professionals must strive to create an atmosphere within their committee structure which provides the neophyte a reassurance that he is an individual of worth who has ideas and opinions which need to be contributed to the group. The group must appear to the neophyte as a comfortable place to try his wings and not get laughed at for his attempts or scorned for a mistake.

But perhaps the hardest question to answer is: How do you raise the consciousness of the professionals to this problem, its scope and ramifications? How do you train professionals to train nonprofessionals? It seems that the power inherent in committee structure and the techniques necessary to manipulate that power is something that everyone has learned the hard way, and they certainly don't want to help someone else to learn it the easy way. Added to the fear that diffused power is

uncontrollable power, these attutudes are probably mainly responsible for the mistrust that exists between professionals and nonprofessionals in group situations. Within the structure of the community coordinating groups throughout the country focusing on child care, this kind of attitude reassessment seems most possible.

The Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (1968) demand that parents be involved at the decision making level. Professionals know how to get the steering committees started, but the real key lies in their ability to incorporate parents and interested citizens into their group as meaningfully as possible. It is the professionals who must face the reality that their expertise is only half the solution to the problem of creating communitywide "care" for children. It is they who must create an optimal environment to allow the community to begin to coordinate itself.

Discussing this with several of the executive directors, coordinators and information secretaries of coordinating groups, I found this is not in any way a new observation and that most coordinating groups have been grappling with the problem for a long time and coming up with very few solutions. In a conference held in Miami (Florida) in March of 1971, a workshop on parent involvement was held. Out of that conference a Black Caucus developed and one their most urgent requests was for this kind of help. They knew that 51% of those on 4-C

boards of directors were parents and that these parents represented predominantly low-income minority families. They also knew that these parents simply "sat" on the board; not because they were not interested, not because they didn't care, but solely because they didn't know how to play the white, middle-class version of "parliamentary ping pont." When you are daily exerting most of your energy just to survive, to get to work and to maintain a home, to shuttle the kids back and forth to the day care center and/or school, to squeeze in trips to the laundromat and supermarket, there is very little time left to devote to learning the political games people play at public meetings or the gamesmanship that goes on before and during committee meetings convened to "come up with some new ideas" or to "get the ball rolling."

Editor's Note: Several reviewers of this paper raised questions about its treatment of parental involvement on boards and committees. On the one hand, a Spanish-speaking reviewer questioned the assumption that the white middle-class formula for the conduct of meetings is a valid standard. "We have all been in meetings where these same parents get their views expressed without knowing parliamentary procedure and reach the objectives of their meeting."

On the other hand, a reviewer with long experience on boards and committees points out that during the first months of board membership, it is appropriate and necessary for any

new member to listen much and talk little, whether a parent or a professional. Boards each have their own existence, style, and mode of operation which any wise person will learn before leaping into the fray.

* * *

Escanaba (Michigan) has approached this problem by typing out a three page explanation of committee proceedings entitled "Are You Going to Run a Meeting?" Although it describes the meeting from the point of view of the chairman, it gives a very good rundown of the kinds of events to expect in the course of any dull, noncontroversial meeting. It uses most of the jargon that needs to be defined within the text of the explanation. Added to this there is a page of "Guidelines for Action at a Meeting," which is a schematic presentation of the basic tenets of parliamentary procedure. This is a good beginning. But again it is only a beginning; it's a tool. Handing someone a hammer and saw and a manual describing how to use them doesn't make that person a carpenter. Part of creating an informed and mobilized group to advocate the needs of children and families is to first inform them and second to show them what to do with that information. The jargon of parliamentary procedure is the first step and it has to be followed by the jargon of the issues to be decided on. For example, acronyms of the federal government agencies bandied around at meetings are absolutely confusing. And those who

spend their work days trying to manipulate those agencies overlook the fact that terms like HEW, OCD, FIDCR, 4-C and FRC have little meaning to tired parents who have worked all day, hassled the dinner-sitter-bedtime scene, then come to spend their evening at a meeting about child care that is carried out in a foreign language.

In-kind donations, ancillary services, clout, matching funds: all of these terms might just as well be Mandarin Chinese or taken from Supreme Court testimony as far as most parents are concerned. And that's just what we're talking about: concern. We parents attend meetings on day care because we <u>are</u> concerned about the children, about their environment, about their community and what that community can provide for the children that it perhaps didn't provide for us. You may have wondered why meeting after meeting we keep coming, keep listening. We are concerned. We care about children and we want the community to care as much.

Providing a bulk of information is not enough to produce coherent decision making procedures. I am in **no way** implying that parents are simpleminded, but I am insisting that we are uninformed and lack access to interpretation of that information. I am even certain that in some cases parents are uninformed because other committee members prefer to have them remain so. The effort involved in raising the consciousness of agency people and professional administrators to the need for parent political education is most likely far greater than the effort

involved in providing that education for the parents. Until the experts who have been calling the shots all along realize that it's time that power was shared, little progress will be visible. Community control demands community involvement and defining the community as that decision making sector already in existence limits the scope of resource mobilization that can be accomplished.

Social services have evolved from the days of benevolent patrons and philanthropists to the days of merciful religious institutions to the days of charitable nonprofit organizations staffed by well meaning well situated middle class volunteers. Now we've arrived at the days of social services as the right of the people. In legal terms we are talking about "entitlement" and Gwen Morgan describes it well in saying:

> This concept is that recipients of public programs are entitled to the full benefits without harrassment. The social program is not a privilege or a gift, but a right.*

We are now realizing that day care has the potential screening mechanism for remedial physical and emotional ills; that it can provide a social enrichment beyond the nuclear family's capabilities; that it can alleviate some of the familial and social stresses families today face and, most importantly in terms of implications, that it is a service essential to returning the welfare family (specifically the single parent

* Morgan, Regulation of Early Childhood Progress, DCCDCA, 1972

family) to the labor force. All of these factors force us to turn our focus to child care as a social service that is a right of the people. That in turn demands that the people have the right to define what kind of service they want. Single parents who work nights have a right to demand 24 hour child care. Parents of handicapped children have a right to either specialized programs or integrating their children into already established programs where the staff can be trained to care for children with special problems. Parents with school age children have a right to demand extended before and after school hours of care. But how are you going to guarantee them that right unless you include them in the community coordination effort, not as tokens of that segment of the community, but as active, decisive members of your group?

Community Involvement

The primary thrust of successful coordination efforts in this country has, of necessity, been aimed at simple child advocacy at the community level. However, gathering together a group of concerned and informed parents, day care providers, agency employees and interested citizens to rally around the needs of children and families in the community is not enough. This group has to expand itself beyond that clique into the community to instill into all citizens the urgency of "caring" for children; not just child care facilities and services but that essential loving warm feeling toward children.

Somehow when adults in our society come of age they seem to leave behind them all the realities of their youth and childhood to take on the effects and rituals of the adult world. They seem no longer capable of identifying themselves with what they were once, only with the day-to-day preparation for the great Tomorrow. Only for the short period that adults become parents do they seem to care about the children they care for. And that care is directed only toward their children. Caring for children as a manifestation of that precious me-I-used-to-be, respecting and preserving that blissful, carefree part of life, is alien to our present society. And for this reason, the advocacy of caring for our children must be the primary focus of any coordinating group trying to mobilize

resources within their community to upgrade existing child care facilities and expand the services of the community.

Although the initial focus of coordinating groups has been day care, there has been a conscious extension to include special forms of day care. Even now the words "day care" conjure up 3 to 5 year-olds in painting smocks in the local preschool. But coordinating groups have been tuning in on parents who often need care for infants as young as 3 months; care for school age youngsters before and after school hours because Mommie's job is from 8 to 5 and she needs to catch the bus at 6:45 am to get there and it takes an hour to make her way through rush hour traffic to return; care for mildly handicapped children integrated with other children; emergency care when Mommie has to go to the hospital and Daddy has to work his regular graveyard shift; sick child care either adjacent to the child's regular facility when he has a temperature and runny nose or in the home when he or his parent is ill; drop-in care for mothers while being interviewed for jobs or doing laundry at the laundromat or spring house cleaning or just taking an afternoon off from all the household drudgery.

We are beginning to view day care not as a privilege either for the poor to get them working or for the well-to-do to allow them self-expression, but as the right of all families as an aid to alleviate some of the stresses of family living

in our hectic society. At a time when "doin' your own thing" is "where it's at," we have begun to realize the importance of providing social institutions which make services available to the individual to help him sustain his responsibilities to that society and yet to maintain his integrity. We are finally beginning to envision child care as an aid to the family, not as a substitute for it. Coordinating groups are beginning to realize that to push day care onto low-income families as a replacement for an environment that they assume to be disadvantaged has perhaps created and encouraged the custodial care everyone has been trying to upgrade for so long.

Coordinating groups must realize that their efforts should be aimed at helping the community sustain its families by encouraging the community to become a "family of families." The community as a whole has got to go through a "consciousness raising" in regard to its attitude toward children. The community must learn to "care" for its children, not just indirectly through impersonal provision of institutions and facilities but personally as individuals. It is those coordinating groups, those cliques of parents, day care providers, agency employees and interested citizens who must take on the responsibility of communitywide consciousness raising.

It is at this juncture that we see how public relations developed through good publicity pays off. If the coordinating

group has been resourceful in utilizing the talents and energies of all its members, has been capable of creating and carrying off meaningful, newsworthy activities, the community by this time should be tuned in to the needs for more and better child care. It should also be tuned in to the existence of a well organized group of people dedicated to attaining these goals. If yours if a 4-C group and you are seeking coordinating agreements to qualify for recognition, and you've utilized your publicity well, it's in the bag. Escanaba (Michigan) within six weeks was able to collect letters of endorsement and coordination agreements from:

the superintendent of the County Intermediate School District

the director of the Community Action Agency

the executive director of the local Economic Development District

the director of the state Department of Social Services

the deputy superintendent for Special Education

the director of the county Department of Social Services

the project supervisor of the Work Incentive Program (WIN)

the director of the District Public Health Department

the superintendent of Public Instruction, state Department of Education

the director of the state Economic Opportunity Office

the director of the Employment Security Commission

the director of the state Department of Public Health.

But even that kind of visibility, recognition and endorsement is only the beginning. All aspects of local and state government theoretically must believe in co-ordination of social services to eliminate duplication of services and overlap of efforts. But what about those in local government, the city council, the planning commission, the county board of supervisors? What about the labor, business and industry your community depends on for employment, especially the ones who predominantly hire women? And what about the college in your community which hires a significant force of clerical women and perhaps educates several student parents? What about civic groups like the Lions, Elk, Moose, Kiwanis, etc.? How many of those people can you attract to your group and activate as advocates for children? This is the crucial point of community involvement. These are the people and groups who have evidenced that they have time, energy and resources at their disposal. Mobilizing these people to build equipment on week ends or organize a pancake breakfast to raise funds or set up a transportation system for taking children on field trips — this is what needs to be done. Very little of this type of accomplishment or even effort has turned up in my research. Maybe it is happening. I hope so, because this is what creates dedicated advocates for children: people working together for and with the children. Throughout the country

many civic groups have focused on the problems of teenage delinquency, drug abuse, venereal disease, etc. But why not also focus on the young children and their needs?

Until coordinating groups begin to look beyond their vested interests in children and begin to advocate child care and recruit others to share in that interest and become advocates, not much can really be achieved.

Again, this is something that requires an administrative staff tuned in to community organization. Incorporating parents into the group is not too difficult; the challenge is to provide the means for them to participate in the decision making process. However, incorporating labor, business, industry, higher education, civic and church groups into the program as active advocates and participants (but not necessarily as decision makers) is a challenge that requires all the efforts and expertise of the whole coordinating group: the staff, the board of directors, the total membership. The dividend in the end, the accessibility to the resources of the community, is what really counts. To this kind of end, coordination of the community for child care, any and all efforts are worthwhile.

Part II: COORDINATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Staff Training

One of the most visible areas of coordination has been that of staff training. The concepts of upgrading existing services and providing more facilities demand upgrading the quality of the staff working with children and recruiting and developing additional staff. Coordinating groups have been able to predict this and to come to grips with the whole issue of training.

Academic programs which include in-service training in the field are cropping up everywhere. And where these programs already existed in vocational training schools or community colleges there are projects geared toward identifying standards and creating mobility within the training system. Some groups have latched on to high school family living classes to include curricula in child care.

Many community colleges provide two year degree programs which provide an Associate of Arts (AA) degree in child care and in some states an Early Childhood Supervisory permit. Coordination efforts are being made to solidify transferrable credits from community colleges into university programs which provide degrees (AB) in Early Childhood Education and even graduate work in the field.

Throughout the country the real thrust has been in-service training for those already working with children. Some staff have been in the career for thirty years with degrees in Home Economics and are innately good at working with children, but child psychology, forms of family living and attitudes about discipline have been rapidly changing. No matter how really adept a person is with children, an awareness of the child's environment, the community environment, the home environment, the child care facility environment, is essential to understanding and communicating with the child. That awareness requires communication between staff members and other persons in the field through either real contact or through the literature of the science.

Preservice training has been and is now, for the most part, handled by already established educational institutions. Funds from the Manpower Development and Training Act, Concentrated Employment Program, Work Incentive (WIN) Program and the Education Personnel Development Act as well as other sundry legislation have enabled recruitment to be carried out almost everywhere. In Waco (Texas) Project Insight in the Summer of 1971 recruited, trained and placed 60 teenagers in 15 agencies, including 43 in child care facilities. Missoula (Montana) has developed a training program for paraprofessionals which they describe procedurally as:

> Twelve enrollees . . . given entry level training consisting of preparatory job related education, classroom instruction, and on-the-job training in a controlled practicum with provision for vestibule instruction.

A day care center was established as a training station and service site. It was first located in a leased facility with plans to later construct a center where it will be possible to serve more than twenty children. There are several communities using Neighborhood Youth Corps volunteers as aids before and after school hours and during summer months. Coordinating groups have been making information on early childhood education careers available to local high schools and community colleges and the response has been enthusiastic.

In-service training, however, has been the focus of coordinating groups more than has preservice simply because that is where the need is most obvious and immediate. Madison (Wisconsin) this past summer sponsored a 15-week Journeyperson Upgrade Training program which provided money to train 30 people with enrollment priorities to persons employed full time. The St. Clair County 4-C Association of East St. Louis, Illinois, owns a Mobile Staff Development Van. Escanaba (Michigan) has developed a great deal of material regarding in-service training which includes a sample workshop format for a staff training plan, a survey of staff to ascertain where they want training focused, an evaluation of the present program's various components as compared to the goals

established and what kinds of training needs this gap represents, as well as a program entitled "Teach a Child to Talk: An Outline of Development" geared to the parent but useful to staff evaluation and an impressive 164 page "Programmatic Approach to Speech and Language Development."

Seattle has developed a unique "Proposal for a Telecourse Project" to provide training for family day care mothers and in-home care workers. This represents an area of staff training that has received relatively little attention. For the most part, training efforts have been aimed at the day care center and its staff most likely because they are readily available and easily encouraged to expand their training since it often means promotions and pay raises. Although incentives are not usually motivating in the family day care situation, truly dedicated child care mothers must be viewed as quite desirous of more training. If we want to view child care as something which should be universally available, then we need also to view training of care givers as a universally available necessity to attain that goal.

Family Day Care

To most people the term child care means day care centers. And unfortunately many coordinating groups prefer to focus their efforts on upgrading and expanding the number of day care centers in their community. Only slowly are some tuning in to the other areas that child care encompasses. One such area is the family day care home. The bulk of child care available and used by working mothers in this country is in a family day care home. The number of licensed family day care homes often belies this fact simply because there are many women caring for the children of neighbors in their own home along with their own children and not bothering to hassle the confusing, discouraging process of becoming licensed.

Coordinating groups who are waking up to the prevalence of this form of child care are realizing the possibilities of expanding this kind of day care to help meet the urgent demands of the community. Yet far too frequently they overlook the serious need to upgrade this kind of service as well as the facility in which it is housed. When family day care homes are licensed, coordinating groups seem to prefer to view them as being "adequate." And yet when they view day care centers as "adequate," the hue and cry goes up and a campaign to create comprehensive care gets underway. What makes family day care homes any different? Gwen Morgan points

out:

> Since licensing rests on a public concern for the prevention of harm, it is most effective if it stays within what can reasonably be expected to be harmful. It is not a useful tool for raising quality.*

And later:

> When licensing becomes confused with the effort to raise quality, it endangers its appropriate function of maintaining a floor.**

Coordinating groups must be made aware of the desperate need to bring licensed home operators in to communication with each other as well as other providers of child care, help them upgrade the services they offer, help them expand the kinds of supportive services they could offer and facilitate some of their operational administrative tasks. When this begins, nonlicensed operators can become aware of the advantages of becoming licensed and affiliated with such a group. This also can create a means of recruiting more providers into the field of family day care.

Licensed family homes can be seen as the logical site for emergency child care, care for the mildly handicapped child, care of family groups of preschoolers, sick child care, any type of care which demands more extensive

---

*Morgan, p. 35

**Morgan, p. 97

supervision, more Tender Loving Care then can sometimes be provided in a larger day care center.

Houston has developed an impressive program of satellite day care homes with clusters of homes centrally administered from a nearby day care center. With much of the operational paper work out of her way, the family day care mother is relieved of a great deal of pressure and perhaps relates better with her children. A central intake system through the day care center office along with centralized medical records for the children help to simplify the day care mother's responsibilities. Gwen Morgan describes such a system and its potentials:

> A family day care system is a group of satellite day care homes which operate sub-parts of a total system which includes them and a central administratave core to provide recruitments of homes, training of family day care mothers, central intake, supervision and consultation, shared equipment, shared trips, a central meeting place for parents to come together with providers, ancillary health and social services. Ideally such a system would have as its heart a group day care center, which can be its model of good child care, training center, and opportunity for career advancement, as well as increasing the options for the parent seeking services for her family. . .
>
> For licensing such a service, we believe it is feasible to license the system as an entity, rather than issuing a separate license to each home. This makes the system itself, monitored by the licensing authority, accountable for seeing that its member homes meet licensing requirements. The system approves its own member homes, as sub-parts of itself, the licensable entity.

---

*Morgan, pps. 81-82

Houston has been able to utilize monies from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for refurbishing homes to be developed into day care homes within Model Cities areas and to earmark those monies for the creation of center/home systems where urban redevelopment is taking place.

Waco (Texas) coordinated a project in 1970 "To develop family day care services through the recruitment, study, evaluation and certification of private homes for the care of children primarily under the age of three." Minor repair of homes to meet requirements was part of the program and the result included 60 family day home mothers and some 120 children.

Missoula (Montana) has on file a survey developed by a Home Economics student from the University of Montana which was created :

(1) to show the relationship and communication that exists between the day care operator and the mother of the children she cares for,
(2) the relationship and communication that exists between the day care operator and the licensing agency, and
(3) to establish the areas of unmet needs that exist within the present program.

This strikes me as another good example of a coordinating group being able to tap resources in the community and utilize available talents and enthusiasm.

In Seattle one of the 4-C Committee task forces has written an evaluation form to be used for family day care

facilities. It includes areas which focus on the care of infants and the extended care provided for school age children. The evaluator is asked to look at all areas of activity and communication between child and care giver where possible and to assess the physical environment both indoors and out, as well as the equipment and toys available to the child. Parts of the evaluation cover the administration of the operation, the nutrition and health components and what (if any) kind of training the day care mother has access to and uses.

Coordinating groups are developing an awareness of family day care programs and the potential within their community. More and more we are realizing that the stigma of custodial care often attached to day care homes can be eliminated and day care mothers, often warm, loving, caring people, are more than willing to learn how to be better providers of child care. All they need is relief from the huge amount of operational busy work, a little consciousness raising about the advantages of licensing and the community's coordination group and a helping hand now and then. One such helping hand is a substitute program used by Pacific Oaks College in Pasadena, California. Students of early childhood education at that community college work closely with day care mothers in their homes during some part of their training, then substitute for the mother when she needs to attend workshops or seminars for training and consultation.*

* June S. Sale, "I'm Not Just a Babysitter: A Descriptive Report of the Community Family Day Care Project," Reprinted by DCCDCA, 1972.

If we can provide the unmet training needs of day care mothers, alleviate some of their administrative tasks, help them negotiate wholesale purchase agreements for food and supplies and incorporate them into the coordination program in the community, we can strengthen the capabilities of the coordinating group, extend the movement further into the community and ultimately expand the number of quality child care options available to families.

Parent Education

Parent education seems to be one of those areas, by and large, which coordinating groups leave to the individual day care facilities in the community. Perhaps this is due to the enthusiasm and communication which usually is more readily apparent at that level of staff/parent/community relationship. We can look upon chats between home day care operators and mothers as the most rudimentary form of parent education and it is inherent in almost any child care program. But parents who use child care services also seem instinctively to know that there is more to raising children these days than the way Mom did it or the way Dr. Spock described it. And child care providers know from their academic background if not from experience that a successful child care environment must be reflected in the home life as well as the day care center/home life. Providers need to know what parents do for and with their children, how they feel about them. Parents need to know the same things about the provider.

But parent education on a community scale can approach a simulation of the education that is required of providers and can afford a common ground for providers and parents to get to know one another, to create a coalition for the betterment of the whole environment of the whole child. Adults who know each other as people don't need to play role

games when they try to communicate. Parents and staff who meet and get acquainted with each other through workshops and become involved in activities together often develop social relationships which bring them to each other's homes. For the child this lessens the gap between the home environment and the day care environment, between the teacher as a symbol and the teacher as a person.

At McLennan Community College in Waco (Texas) the 4-C group and the city of Waco Model Cities Program sponsored Parent Involvement Workshops on one Saturday in each of three months called "Bridging Home and School." The description pamphlet notes:

> The parent is the most significant teacher in the life of the child and the child's development is further enhanced when the parents and the child care staff communicate effectively with one another to bring harmony into the child's world.

Waco has also sponsored an ongoing series called the Parent's Problem Clinic which highlights speakers such as Dr. Haim Ginott, author of Between Parent and Child, and Dr. George Henderson of the University of Oklahoma, followed by discussions and question and answer periods with the parents and staff.

In addition to parent education both Waco and Escanaba (Michigan) provide programs and training for volunteers utilized in child care programs. Waco's is a summer program for teenage volunteers who are oriented, registered and placed in various child care, health and recreation agencies within

the city. Escanaba has incorporated volunteers and parents into staff training programs wherever possible to maximize those resources whenever possible.

Because of the nature and situation of Waco, they have even developed a series of 4 seminars for the parents of Mexican-American children enrolled in preschool and school programs. The series focused on: what bilingual education is, who needs it, why they need it, when they need it and for how long a period, how and where it should be used, who should teach it, and what about non-English speakers?

The optimal way to be looking at parent education seems to be: what's good for the staff is good for the parent. Ultimately it is the child who will benefit. And to coordinate staff training and parent education seems to generate more funds from different parts of the coordinating budget. Parenthood, like citizenship, is a rather haphazard task. Once we come to realize that we are, indeed, a parent (or citizen) we are also struck by the startling realization that we are not quite sure what to do next. Developing communication patterns between parents and staff, availing parents of the education that staff persons bring to their task, can undoubtedly help to provide some in-service training for parenthood.

Information

We can look at information from several perspectives, and when community coordination is successful, coordinating groups not only view it from several angles but actually deal with it on many levels. Perhaps the most obvious to these groups is information about "what already exists." Most groups feel that coordination presumes knowing what it is you want to coordinate and, therefore, their first glance at information means doing a "survey". This can range from: how many children in our community from the ages X to Y? how many public, private, home day care facilities are in operation? how long are their waiting lists? to more simplistic sounding questions that turn out to be difficult to grapple with simply from the point of view of manpower and paper usage implied. Beyond that there are the more intricate areas of: what might the picture look like next year? or in 5 years? what services are available to children and families now? what services should be available? how can we upgrade the quality of the programs that exist? how do we build the quality into expansion plans?

As is apparent, surveys can take several multi-faceted forms, enormous amounts of time and money and can deplete the energy resources of both staff and the coordinating group. It appears that the most effective surveys (on a large scale, that

is) have been contracted out. A community with a well organized, well funded planning agency usually has most of that information where needed. A smaller community, on the other hand, will often let the information from a less complex survey suffice. The crux of the problem seems to arise in county-wide or multi-county coordinating groups. It is here that true coordination comes to play a decisive role in the success or failure of the project. The Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association mobilized citizen groups in sections of Hennepin County to survey child care needs. From this the county published Day Care: Planning to Meet Community Needs.

The crucial point is that surveys cannot be looked upon as goals in themselves. The survey needs to be viewed as a tool integral to the planning process, the information base for making decisions. Also it needs to be viewed as information to be disseminated to the community. It is from this point of view that coordinating groups set up information and referral systems. This is something that can be integrated right into the 4-C office. It can be incorporated into an already established community switchboard. More often than not it is extended into a 24-hour service using an answering service. This seems to be especially so when 24-hour emergency child care services have been developed somewhere in the community. The scope of information that can be

available to the public from this source always includes where there are child care facilities with space available to the caller. In addition, some are able to offer counseling and referral to any of several agencies offering services to families from marriage counseling to family planning to landlord-tenant problems.

In the Metropolitan Portland (Oregon) 4-C, perhaps the most comprehensive information network has been implemented. This excerpt from a snopsis of a "Proposal for Tri-County Child Care Information and Referral Service Submitted by the Southeast Point of Information Referral to Tri-County Community Council," written in March, 1972, best conveys the dynamic scope of such a project.

SOUTHEAST POINT OF INFORMATION AND REFERRAL:

Since our office opened in May, 1971, we have received calls from 487 families seeking information about child care services. A number of these families reside outside of Southeast Portland. We have attempted to help all families who have called us, regardless of their residence or income level. To date, we have referred families to 4-C funded child care programs, Head Start programs, privately-operated centers, kindergardens, pre-schools, and co-ops and neighborhood babysitters. In addition, many families call seeking names of available babysitters in their area. We have complied a

list of available babysitters; in addition, we have found that school secretaries and room-mothers are good sources of information about neighborhood babysitters. We make a point of following up on our initial contact with each family to find out if they have been successful in securing child care or need additional information. We are now finding that families who have received assistance from us in the past are calling for new referral information.

Our referral staff (which currently consists of two people) is in continuous contact with various child care services in the tri-county area. Last summer we devised a form which we sent to these agencies, asking that they return the form each month to indicate the number of vacancies they have in their program. In addition, we try to check with an agency offering special services (eg. Parent-Child Services, Child Guidance Clinic) before we refer a particular family to them. In this way we hope to eliminate the practice of "shuffling families from one agency to another." We are also trying to implement the Day Care Neighbor concept in locating and interviewing women in particular neighborhoods who can be a resource for referrals. We have found, however, that the concept does not always work in low-income neighborhoods where there is a high degree of mobility.

In addition to providing information about child care services, we feel our referral service is providing another

important function: listening. Some mothers feel guilty about finding substitute care for their children while they work, and hence are full of doubt and self-reproach in making their decision to go back to work. They need a good listening ear as they debate the pros and cons of returning to work; they also need information about the costs of substitute care. Other mothers who have called, obstensibly for information about child care programs, are really seeking help in relating to their children. One such mother was referred to Parent-Child Services, and our staff secured special permission for her to enroll because her income was too high. While our referral staff is trained in listening skills, we currently lack professional counselors to work with "multi-problem families."

Recently our office has been involved in providing another service — interviewing people who are looking for employment in a child care program. We hope, ultimately, to be able to develop a pool of potential child care workers and substitutes that can be drawn on by child care programs.

Finally, our staff is providing information to individuals and groups who are interested in setting up child care programs. We have worked not only with potential 4-C provider agencies, but also with individuals and groups interested in operating private centers. Our information to these potential day care providers includes statistics on need, certification requirements,

funding sources available, etc. We believe that child care referrals and program development go hand in hand.

Information, then, is essential to the coordinating and planning process. Until the information can be gathered, analyzed and disseminated, the whole process of mobilizing resources is a moot point. In terms of accomplishment in the areas of coordination and planning, nothing can be coordinated until it has been defined and pinpointed, and until we have data on what exists we cannot possibly begin to plan how to upgrade, expand or even implement programs. And beyond its usefulness in coordination and planning, we have got to view its usefulness to the individuals and families of the community.

When the coordinating group is able to locate the services and facilities, they must also be capable of foreseeing the desperate need the community has for access to this information NOW. Parents need to find a day care center or home for their children so they can go to work. Providers need to know where to find substitutes or learn about nutrition or arrange medical screening. These are immediate needs, they must be met immediately. Because of both uses, immediate and long range, information retrieval and dissemination need to be a top priority for the coordinating committee and its staff.

There is another kind of vital information that must be developed and disseminated and that is information about the coordination group. This is something beyond the kind of information used to generate the visibility we talked about earlier. This kind of information involves keeping the group and all other interested citizens informed about what's happening right here in our community and what our coordination is doing to accomplish its goals. Several groups have newsletters. Springfield (Massachusetts) runs theirs off on a stencil; Maryland 4-C has theirs printed offset. Both cover legislative events at the local, state and federal levels, child care programs of merit and/or interest - anything that keeps those involved with any aspect of child care informed. Seattle has sponsored a workshop in "Grantsmanship — The Name of the Game is Proposal-Writing." Waco held a planning seminar for a group of local planners and agency administration officials. Springfield has circulated a list of "Suggested Activities for Local 4-C Committees Which Have No Staff." Seattle also offers a breakdown on "What Should a Child-Care Proposal Contain?"

This type of information is meant for the providers, the professionals, the people who make the decisions and implement the programs. It is a vital kind of information because it is a step toward disspelling the belief that there is an elite clique of people who make decisions and implement

plans. This kind of information makes it possible for more concerned citizens to make decisions, to implement plans, to have access to the tools that create wheels and to the forces that make then turn.

Expansions

With or without coordination groups, most communities have seen increases in the number of child care slots available, whether through additions of more child care centers or the licensing of more homes. But generally where coordination groups have been active, new kinds of child care have been developing. Not because new kinds were thought up, but because the coordination groups seem to have been able to tune in to the needs of their community and to mobilize efforts to accommodate those needs.

Portland (Oregon) has developed a proposal for "Day and/or Night Care Services." Missoula (Montana) developed a satellite day care unit at the University of Montana for students and community people and are focusing proposals on providing summer enrichment programs and summer camps available to children (mostly school age, however) of working parents. Within the specific aims of their descriptive narrative, they want to "provide periods of respite for the family and individual" in the cases of mentally and physically handicapped children. They are achieving this through a project entitled: "Community/Regional Centered Programs for the Mentally and Physically Handicapped." Seattle has compiled information on "How to Develop School-Age Day Care Programs" and has indeed expanded their program of extended child care for schoolage children.

Kinds of child care that can be provided seem to depend on what needs to be provided. This means that it is the parent/consumers who must be looked upon as the primary source of information when deciding where to go from here, what we should develop next. Where coordinating bodies are really listening to the parents on their boards and in their community they are finding out where to expand child care. They are learning that child care needs to be something more than the preschool experience in terms of its convenience to parents. They are also learning that parents demand more than a place to leave the children. They want warmth and love, nutritious meals, accessible adults, other happy children and an enriching, educational experience for their children when they cannot stay home. Coordinating groups are learning that this is what parents want for their children while they are working, before and after school hours, while the child is very young (infant care), when the parent must be absent from the home (emergency care), when the child and/or parent is ill (sick child care). And these are just the kinds of comprehensive care that parents need now. What about next year?

Supportive Services

Another area of coordination which is growing out of the demands coming from the community is that of supportive services. These needs come as much from the staff as they do from the parents. Several coordinating groups are adding to their staffs specialists in many fields such as child development, nutrition, public health, parent involvement/education to be available to staff and parents throughout the community as well as to develop specialized programs for delivering related supportive services.

Missoula has developed a proposal for an equipment library to be available to day care homes. Minneapolis provides child care arrangements for organizations for large conferences. Houston has made arrangements for transportation of infants to child care facilities:

> Occasionally the mother of an infant who needs day home care finds that her schedule or the location of the home makes it impossible for her to get the baby to the day home and still make it to work or training on time. In a few cases we have offered a new service. Retired day home operators serve as "bus hostesses" and hold infants on the trip from home to the operator's home.

Athens (Georgia) has arranged for the Police Community Relations Department to provide transportation for preschools for field trips. They have made their Clothes Closet available to child care facilities so they can avoid sending children home in soiled or damp clothes.

Madison (Wisconsin) has included in its list of 4-C priorities a category of services for providers which include among other things:

*Joint purchases of supplies, equipment, office materials

*Coordination of and/or joint purchase of related services such as medical, nutritional, mental health, social or computer services (for bookkeeping)

*Contract for group health insurance coverage for all personnel in member agencies

*Substitute teacher or care-giver file

*Equipment library and loan service for family home care mothers, nursery schools, day care centers, extended care programs, etc. Emphasis might be on the larger or more expensive items.

*Lists of films for use with children, in-service training or parent meetings.

Again this is only an idea of what is being accomplished by some groups, an idea of what might be attempted. Which supportive services can be useful, which ones are essential are matters to be assessed by the community. Only when the coordinating group really communicates with the community and particularly with the parent/consumers in a meaningful, open manner can the real priorities be established. Only when the professionals and providers, the agencies and their officials, the parent/consumers and interested citizens can get together with the intent of "caring" for the children of the community will the coordinating group be capable of assessing priorities, coordinating programs, planning changes

and implementing plans. Again, Gwen Morgan pinpoints the crux of the workability matter for 4-C and it applies to all community coordination for child care:

> 4-C works well apparently when there is a way of resolving the power conflicts and bringing the agencies together, their legal mandates in their hands, around the same neutral table. It needs both authority and neutrality.*

* Morgan, p. 111

Part III: CREDIBILITY PROBLEMS

The struggles of developing and organizing a coordinating committee for child care are perhaps endless. And nothing emphasizes this more than some of the credibility problems which groups must face at all levels.

The most invidious attacks come, perhaps, from the local community. The most startling that this research turned up comes from Missoula, Montana. Because of its stark reality it has been included here in its entirety.

UNITED GIVERS
of Missoula County

P.O. Box 1122 - 513 Western Montana Bank Building
Missoula, Montata 59801 - Phone 549-8938

June 9, 1972

Coordinated Community Child Care
Mary Patten, Director
508 Toole Avenue
Missoula, Montana 59801

Dear Mary:

On Wednesday, June 7, 1972 the Board of Directors of the United Givers of Missoula County met to determine agencies to be supported and allocations to these agencies for 1973. I have been asked to inform you that your agency was not selected for support after December 31, 1972. From the lengthy discussion preceding this decision I concluded that the Board feels your work is duplicatory of existing agencies and that a full-time coordinator is not required. While it was evident that the Board recognizes the need for improved child care, the members do not believe this is a productive means of obtaining it.

This letter will serve as notification to you as required by paragrath 7 of our agreement. Your allocation checks will continue through December 1972.

The Board further asked me to express to you its appreciation for the sincere effort you have been and are making to improve the lot of the community's children.

Sincerely,

Howard K. Welch
Executive Director

* * *

It is appalling that in the state of Montana where a Children's Rights Amendment has been added to the State Constitution this kind of communication could come from a funding source. Considering the kinds of coordination evident in the activities and achievments of the Missoula-Mineral Counties 4-C it is inconceivable that the Board of the United Givers could believe that a full-time coordinator is not a "productive means" of obtaining improved child care.

It may be that effectively coordinating local services and developing programs is not sufficient to sustain the efforts of the group. The value of these programs has got to be communicated beyond those who have a vested interest in these programs alone. The coordinating group has to develop a visibility in the community as a whole and to reach out into the hard core nonbelievers of social services. United Givers believes in social services but the challenge comes when we approach the individual members of those Boards

of Directors, when we face the prospect of converting them to child advocacy, when we communicate to them the desperate need that children have for a concerted care from the community as a whole.

Another bottleneck which frequently crops up as an obstacle to really getting the ball rolling is that of accountability. The following letter directed to the Appropriations Conference Committee of the U. S. Senate (Congressional Conferees on the Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill) from the Central Vermont 4-C Committee typifies these kinds of problems.

August 5, 1972

Chairman,
Appropriation Conference Committee
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senators and Congressmen,

Yesterday in reading a statement concerning HEW Appropriation Bill (H.R. 15417) I came upon the phrase "not convinced that states are spending the money 'prudently and effectively'" in connection with ceiling limit of $2.5 billion on Titla IV-A Funds. I would like to explain that in connection with our 4-C Committee (Central Vermont) that there are people within the committee who are trying to spend this money "prudently and effectively" but are constantly thwarted by those other factions who it seems have vested interests in the expenditure of money.

1. A majority block of votes are controlled by professional agencies which have a questionable interest in the committee (esp. in regards to money spending).

2. Employees who try to run the committee and instigate programs which perpetuate their own employment with inflated salaries. Employees whose hiring was under dubious circumstances and who refuse to allow the committee to expand the scope of their jobs and bring their salaries in line with other salaries in the field.
3. Combine these two factions and those they influence on the committee and then realize that many members on the committee one half (which includes 2/3 of the parents) are discouraged from attending by the over-riding attention to administration and you find no benefits going to the children.

For 1½ years we have been fighting through one obstacle to another to get to do some work which would directly affect the children and we still continue with administrative fighting over how long vacation, how many hours work, where office is going to be, etc. endlessly. These questions still not satisfied after 5 hour meetings; and not one mention of children. No attempts to draw from the committee any thoughts about what we can do for children in our area.

They want 4-C to succeed so that they can list their support, keep their jobs, etc., but nowhere do I see them come up with any desire to promote some services to the children other than dole out that $28.00 a week to day care centers which still take 4 - 6 weeks to get to them. (We have a staff member getting $192.00 a week just for this purpose.)

We are getting discouraged. Recently their block appointed a committee to rework job descriptions and contracts which were coming due. Their block elected a parent chairman which we desired on the ballot for fair democracy-although we voted for another member who we felt would be more effective. Working together with this chairman and this committee, we worked hard to develop new ideas and prudent budgetting. (Leaving money for workshops, counselors, fund raising - a number of various and child-oriented ideas). We were not radical but tried to remain fairly conservative keeping in mind OCD guidelines and contract obligations. Bearing in mind we worked with their people - on the night which our ideas were supposed to be reviewed and passed so that we could get on to priority work for children they presented stumble block after stumble block. They wanted our corporation to model after their corporation ad infinatum. Then they throw a description which does not bear in mind OCD and FAP commitments and which contains the same ideas which we had included in our

proposal. After 1 AM with nothing decided staff are instructed to write the job descriptions for themselves. Of course all must be approved by committee but when there are few parents and few who are not in this per order of agency the committee has little hope of being community minded.

I do not wish to give up on helping the children. I do not wish to deny them services, but if we continue to function as a paper committee just signing money away and no active work by active people for the children and human beings we will remain no more.

I agree with the Senate statement but I seek to assure you that there are some who attempt to act "prudently and effectively" but are losing hope in their own ability to be an equal with those who are getting paid to be on the committee.

Peace,

Mrs. Joan-Lee Chaffee
P.O. Box 28
S. Woodbury, Vt. 15671

Mrs. Pace Nicolino
20 John Street
Barre, Vt. 05641

CC: Day Care & Child Development
Council of America
1401 K. St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Deane Davis, Gov.
State Office Building
Montpelier, Vt. 05602

Dr. Joan Babbott
Office of Child Development
State Street
Montpelier, Vt. 05602

Susan Bloch, Chairman
Central Vermont 4-C
Worcester, Vt.

Rogers Strauss
Washington County Mental Health
100 E. State St.
Montpelier, Vt. 05602

* * *

And this letter from the Vermont Office of Child Development reflects the concern often expressed from that office at the state and regional levels but also indicates the absence of clearcut guidelines from which the Federal Regional Committees and particularly the OCD representative (regional director) might be able to function.

OFFICE OF
CHILD DEVELOPMENT
43 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

August 18, 1972

Mrs. Joan-Lee Chaffee
P.O. Box 28
So. Woodbury, Vermont 05671

and

Mrs. Pace Nicolino
20 John Street
Barre, Vermont 05641

Dear Mrs. Chaffee and Mrs. Nicolino:

I have received a copy of your August 5 letter to the U.S. Congressional Appropriations Conference Committee and would like to comment.

First of all, I am - I think - well aware of the difficulties that all members of the Central Vermont 4-C Committee have experienced in trying to work through that Committee to achieve the generally similar goals for children and families that all members of that Committee seem to share. I am aware that the experience in that Committee has been frustrating and sometimes hostile, and that there has been some wasted time and some wasted energy. It is generally my belief that there has been some progress lately, and it is generally my belief that much of the frustration, hostility and even "the waste" is an unavoidable and perhaps even necessary part of the growth and development of the decentralized Regional 4-C concept that we have been hoping to establish in Vermont.

Myself and members of my staff have been and remain willing to meet with you and to work with the Central Vermont 4-C Committee to address ourselves to any specific grievances. I will, in fact, ask the (Acting) Assistant Director for Program Management (Michael Wriston) to contact you immediately with regard to this letter and any other problems that this Office may be of some assistance with. I do, however, have a great deal of confidence in your Chairwoman (Susan Bloch) and both hope and believe that the Central Vermont 4-C Committee will be able to deal primarily with its own problems and able to perform satisfactorily in this last year of the Vermont FAP Project (and beyond the performance and workability of all eight Regional 4-C Committees will be assessed at the end of the Project by this Office).

Secondly, with regard to your first point ("A majority block of votes are controlled by professional agencies----"etc.). This, of course, should not be and would be a violation of 4-C guidelines. I will let the Chairman of the State 4-C Committee (Dan Holland) know immediately of your concerns in this area and ask that the State 4-C Committee assure both you and this Office that 4-C guidelines are being followed in Central Vermont.

Finally, your points with regard to "inflated salaries" ($192/wk), "factions", "job descriptions" et cetera, are ones that I consider to be largely of local concern, although I shall ask Mr. Wriston to explore them with you.

I appreciate your concern. I hope that I have been, and will continue to be, of some help, and I look forward (?) to moving with you to resolve these problems. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joan G. Babbott, M.D.
Director, Office of Child Development

CC: Governor Deane Davis
Senator George D. Aiken
Senator Robert T. Stafford
Congressman Richard W. Mallary
William Cowles, Secretary, Agency of Human Services
Day Care and Child Development Council of America
Susan Bloch, Chairwoman, Central Vermont 4-C Committee
Daniel J. Holland, Chairman, State 4-C Committee
Roger Strauss, Executive Director, Washington County Mental Health
Michael Wriston (Acting) Assistant Director for Program Management, OCD

* * *

The ability to develop and organize a coordinating group, the need to develop permanent, sound funding sources for coordination efforts and the necessity to build within that group accountability mechanisms from the very outset are the three essential challenges to be met when establishing credibility at the community level. But beyond this, sadly enough, there are credibility problems at the state and federal levels. The amount of information pertaining to this which has been gathered in Region I, primarily in the State of Massachusetts, and disseminated as widely as possible indicates the depth and pervasiveness of this problem.

The Region I Federal Regional Committee created a task force to define the roles of local, state and federal 4-C committees. In each area problems were identified and recommendations filed. We will explore the portions of that report as they relate to the role of the local 4-C Councils. (The scope of this research prevents us from really grappling with the problems of Regional and Federal coordination. Perhaps this will generate an effort to assess those aspects of coordination. But it is the main intent of this publication to view the dynamics of community coordination at the community level. State, regional and federal information has been included only as it is germane to the local community issue.)

(DRAFT - For comment
and revision before
September 6, 1972)

TASK FORCE ON THE ROLE OF 4-C

REGION I - FEDERAL REGIONAL

4-C COMMITTEE

MEMBERS OF THE TASK FORCE:

Mildred Hamilton, Chairman
Gwen Morgan
Angelita Garcia
Linda Broderick
Agnes Rogers
Bonnie Post

RESOURCE PEOPLE:

THE ROLE OF LOCAL 4-C COUNCILS:

There are three major roles which 4-C Councils might fill: (1) child advocacy planning; (2) a clearinghouse of information and (3) a mechanism for resource allocation in a geographic area.

CHILD ADVOCACY PLANNING:

The most important role of local 4-C Councils is advocacy planning for the children in their geographic areas. Child advocacy planning includes the following tasks, inseparably interlinked as part of the same process which is circular rather than linear:

1. Assessing the needs for services in the geographic area. This means developing, or causing some member agency in the area to develop, useful data on the numbers of children, and the numbers of children with various special needs from infancy throughout the childhood years. In many communities such data does not exist, particularly for the ages 0-5.

2. Identifying gaps in services, and overlaps in services, among the agencies of the community, and taking action to fill gaps and eliminate overlaps and potential overlaps.

3. Identifying problems, proposing solutions, generating new ideas. Specifying needed action, and stimulating that such action is taken by some agency in the community.

4. Assuring quality of programs. 4-C Councils are particularly effective in working toward quality in three ways:

a. Bringing about more effective participation by parents, providers of services, and public and private administrators in the development of standards.

b. Public education into the needs of children and what makes good programs.

c. Training, identifying common training needs in a geographic area, and stimulating ways of meeting the needs through mutual efforts.

5. Establishing the goals of the community, deciding on immediate objectives, establishing priorities among objectives, and proposing action. In this way new program development fits in with long term goals.

6. Mobilization of resources to meet community needs.

7. Amending community plans and programs on the basis of feedback from evaluation.

In addition to child advocacy planning, there are certain services which 4-C Councils, by their very nature and structure, are in an ideal position to perform. There are:

CLEARINGHOUSE FUNCTIONS:

Since all the service-providing agencies sit around the same table in the 4-C Concept, this body will automatically become a central seat of all the information which has been previously so badly fragmented among agencies and levels of government. (Local citizens frequently ask with a high degree of feeling for "one place to go" rather than the present shunting from agency to agency and local to state to federal levels and back again. There are a number of basic types of information which need such a clearinghouse, and the need is so great and so obvious that 4-C Councils, in our experience, almost as soon as they are formed, begin to receive requests for information and to get information to people who need it. Soon they are heavily involved in meeting this previously unmet community need.) The different types of clearinghouse functions are the following:

a. Information and referral services to children and families. By this is not meant case work counseling or diagnostic services; families needing this type of help are referred to the best source of such help.

b. In addition, the 4-C Councils begin to be asked to locate staff by service agencies, and those seeking employment begin to find that the 4-C Coundil is the best source of information about employment in the area.

c. Program information is badly needed in communities, and 4-C Councils begin to be central sources of information about what makes good programming, for a variety of services, what other communities are trying, what the results of research and demonstration programs have been. Such information is needed by providers of services, and by parents.

d. Related to (c) is the function of providing the outreach on behalf of nearby demonstration and research programs while they are still going on, assuring maximum effect and usefulness for such programs by disseminating their results to those who need them while the program itself may be visited as a model.

e. Another type of information which 4-C Councils have found themselves asked to supply has been information on policy changes, proposed legislation, and other such matters requiring community interest of those who wish to support legislation and greater priority to quality services to children.

f. 4-C Councils are the one single source of information about funds available for services to children, channels through which these funds flow, and guidelines for their administration.

ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES FUNCTIONS-

4-C Councils have sometimes served as an umbrella funding mechanism for receiving and distributing funds for a particular service, such as day care, and certain other services. Some Councils have served as the single receiving point for federal funds under Title 4-A of the Social Security Amendments from the state, subcontracting with the operating agencies and new proposed agencies in the area, as a way of allocating this source of funds in a planned way in the area. In the case of the peculiar donated funds 4-A mechanism and under-the-table deals, instead expanding services in a planned and cooperative

way with all the community agencies participating in the planning.

Other 4-C Councils have preferred not to be the funding agency, but to serve as the planning agency to make decisions as to the allocation of funds according to needs within the geographic area, by recommending which agencies should receive funds and the level of funding.

Should new federal legislation pass expanding child development services, and creating Councils for children to handle the new funds, the existing 4-C Councils should either be designated to become the new Councils described in the bill, or, if they are unwilling to meet the legal requirements, they should be replaced by other Councils which should take on 4-C functions, since the overlap in role which would be caused by two local planning bodies is likely to be extremely destructive.

4-C as a planning and coordinating body should not operate programs itself, except for certain services which derive naturally from its nature and structure, such as information and referral services, distribution of information, and perhaps monitoring services. 4-C will be more effective in its ability to plan and coordinate if it does not seek to become a competitor against its member agencies for the same state and federal funds.

* * * *

The role of 4-C described above outlines the role which a local 4-C Council plays. The roles of the state and federal 4-C Committees are similar in many ways, since they, too, will be assessing needs and resources at their level of government, establishing goals, and objectives and allocating resources to meet those goals and objectives according to policy established at their level. It is essential to the 4-C concept that these levels of government each dovetail their planning as appropriate for each level of government. Without cooperation among all three levels, effective programs cannot and will not be developed. The 4-C concept calls for a bottom-up type of planning, without which programs are unlikely to develop and thrive. Yet this bottom-up planning must meet with a responsive top-down type of fiscal mobilization and policy direction at both the state and federal levels or it is doomed to failure. Top-down state and/or federal planning is equally doomed to failure if it is not met with a responsive bottom-up mechanism for program development. 4-C offers a mechanism, and three years of trial-and-error expertise for the kinds of action which must take place at every level for integrated service delivery.

* * * * * *

As a result of this task force's findings and their subsequent report, the Federal Regional Committee of Region I developed a position paper which raised six significant questions. At the base of each of these questions is a plea to the federal government, the Office of Child Development and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to go beyond simply recognizing the coordination efforts being implemented across the nation and reaffirm those lip-service commitments with monetary help and technical assistance where needed. Briefly, Region I wants to know:

1. Why is there so little communication in the 4-C system?
2. Why haven't 4-C communities received priority for funding for certain children's programs?
3. Why has not stronger support been given to the existing 4-C system in administration testimony before the Congress?
4. Why had OCD given no visibility to this activity?
5. Why has HEW not made stronger efforts to avoid competition among federal agencies within HEW, and by those agencies against agencies outside HEW, by requiring approval of funding?
6. Why hasn't HEW more actively sought financial support for 4-C?

Although these questions all speak to the Community Coordinated Child Care programs, the problems they pinpoint are integral to all coordination programs geared to the needs of children and families. We are all aware of the current administration's verbal commitment to the wellbeing of this country's children, but we are also all aware of the lack of true assistance, financial and technical, which is necessary to realize that goal.

The credibility problems which each community group faces in trying to advocate more and better services for children and families in this country reach their peak at the federal level. But this by no means lessens their acuteness at the local community. The first line of attack must be the local community to establish credibility and the final line of defense, and the strongest, turns out to be the federal government. And who was it who developed the idea of community coordination for child care four years ago?

Part IV: CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Coordinating mechanisms focusing on child care at the community level have been in existence for quite some time in some metropolitan areas. Since the federal dictum which created the Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C) program in 1968, these groups have all begun to become more visible. There have been successes, setbacks and even some failures throughout the country. Successes in coordination have been at the local community levels and from time to time at the state levels. But the greatest impact has been where groups of people at the community level have gotten together, generated enthusiasm within their community, expanded their groups to include those new recruits and then mobilized to scour the community for resources to develop, expand and upgrade the quality of child care.

Groups who have gotten together and prepared all the documents necessary for recognition and are sitting back waiting for monies to flow from the federal government for their communities are doing just that: sitting back and waiting. Coordination efforts, and particularly 4-C programs, have endured in spite of the federal auspices which created them, not because of them. This hard fact of life is as encouraging as it is sad. In our country the federal government has long been known for its grandiose plans for social reform

followed by lip-service commitment. Any level of government yields this kind of attitude and many are the people who tacitly accept it right along with "death and taxes." But fortunately for social reform there are those of us who will not passively condone flowery rhetoric and blatant inaction. From community to community we have banded together to take on City Hall, the Governor and even Congress for the sake of an ideal. This has been the case with several child care coordinating bodies (albeit too few). Some coordinating groups, wary of federal control, have bypassed the 4-C model to work within their own framework.

Why those successful groups have been successful is what we have tried to explore throughout this paper. What kinds of people and objectives and goals and activities were involved tempts us to look for patterns of components, the magic formula to create effective coordination. Although we are certain no such formula exists, there is no doubt that there is a continuum of commonality throughout the programs we have focused on. It would be nice to guarantee that to follow all the steps these programs have would lead to certain success. But we must keep in mind that no two communities, just like no two persons, are alike. What works for Seattle may not work for Miami and vice versa. But that does not mean that it is not worth considering or even trying. Perhaps

too often coordinating groups have lost the spirit of adventure, the attitude of "let's give it a try." After all, almost anything backed by enthusiasm and sound planning is possible.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

When I first began the task of researching this paper I expected glowing responses from the successful coordinating groups to which I sent letters requesting information about their programs. I knew from my own experiences that coordinating groups really needed information about each other, about what they were doing, about what they had tried to do. When I first received the following letter from Escanabe, Michigan I was stunned. Later I realized that it really only typified, if not intensified the pervasive need that coordinating groups have for information about each other across the country.

MENOMINEE - DELTA - SCHOOLCRAFT
COMMUNITY ACTION!

CATHERINE BONIFAS CIVIC CENTER
ESCANABE, MICHIGAN 49829

Room 101
255 North 21st Street

PHONE: 786-7080

August 3, 1972

Ms. Patty Ratcliff, Special Projects Writer
Day Care and Child Development Council of
America, Inc.
1401 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

RE: 4-C Research

Dear Ms. Ratliff;

I have several questions regarding your request for information about the activities of our local 4-C. The questions being raised by our membership are:

1. To what use will this information be put - are you going to provide the President and Congress with actual accomplishments of 4-C groups to enable us to become more visible, or is this another study to gather dust?

2. Since this request will entail a great deal of staff time to complete as well as a great deal of duplication of documents and since we have no operating money, what benefits will accrue to local 4-C Councils as a result of this study?

3. Since 4-C is attempting to build a communications system via federal national to federal regional to state to local and back, what efforts have you made at coordinating the resources available from National, Regional and State 4-C sources to eliminate duplication of efforts and perhaps open new resources to you?

Our committee feels that they should have answers to these questions, before we allow materials developed in this area to be used. I hope you understand their position, but as I have stated previously, we have worked long and hard without any additional money for operations or staff and we feel that we must be very careful that information be used to the best possible use for furthering the 4-C concept. We shall be awaiting your reply.

Sincerely,

Shirley Oczus
Chairman, Menominee-Delta-Schoolcraft 4-C Association

CC: Clara Noble, Michigan
Jim Fisco

* * * * *

And from this point of view I arrived at my first recommendation:

(1) A communications network which would include a

nationwide information system, regional informational

and referral networks and a local chain of reciprocal newsletters among coordination groups.

Needless to say, a network as pervasive as this requires resources beyond what now exist. And this is where we must demand more than lip-service commitment from the federal government. To avoid reinventing the wheel time and again, to avoid spinning our wheels at every turn in the road, coordination must be a well informed effort throughout the country. We must demand that the Office of Child Development add to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare budget a line item for communication and information retrieval, storage and dissemination specifically geared to coordination efforts for child care in communities, states and federal regions. Further, that line item must include monies to go directly to coordinating groups to publish and circulate to each other progress reports, newsletters, proposals, anything that might have the potential for replication elsewhere.

The end result of this extensive communications network would create a visibility for the child care coordination effort that would make obvious the need for comprehensive federal, state and local legislation to release funds to create comprehensive child care for the children and families of our country. That kind of commitment would make this statement, again from Escanaba, Michigan, unnecessary:

> We have concerns that the federal support which was indicated in the beginning will not be forthcoming. We realize that we have not gone out and "sold our wares" so to speak to Congress, but we have been too busy serving children to use our limited time and resources in attempting to persuade Congress that we have something going that is good for kids.

* * *

The second recommendation I have stems from my own experiences as a parent/consumer member of a developing 4-C committee. Time and again the information received from across the country and in telephone conversations recounts the desperate need for:

(2) A nationwide effort to upgrade the quality of consumer input.

In the section on parent involvement in Part II everything we covered leads to this conclusion, so it certainly should come as no surprise. Again, OCD through the HEW budget should be providing funds to develop an ongoing technical assistance project to effect consciousness-raising of coordination groups to the true need for valid parent input to their decision making process. Such a project would involve workshops at the local level and wherever possible planned, organized and presented by the parents themselves. To attain the goal of maximum awareness we must view self-help as the most essential objective.

Raising the consciousness of providers, professionals and agency people is Step One. Step Two is providing the

information to the parents along with a method of giving them a chance to develop some facility in the art of politics. But to do that we need to be aware of the massive demands on time and energy the working parent must cope with, particularly the single parent. A Labor Department survey shows that married women who work a 40-hour week actually work a 79-hour week when all of their household responsibilities are considered.* Coordinating groups must demand leaves of absence for community involvement for all employees, not just executives. When a parent relegates the care of her children to someone for as much as 50 hours a week we need to provide her with time to work at or with that child care facility and time to be active in the coordinating group that is the community's voice for child advocacy. When a low-income minority parent in Waco, Texas found it too difficult to keep coming to the local 4-C meetings the executive director of the 4-C met with the president of the company the parent works for and insisted that they provide community involvement leave. And they did. There is no reason this can't be tried elsewhere, and successfully.

If community coordination is how we want to create more and better care for our children and valid parent participation

---

* "Working Women and Their Family Responsibilities," Department of Labor, p. 16

is integral to community control, then coordinating groups must pay more than lip-service to that commitment. And the only way they can meet that commitment is if the bureaucracies of the executive branch of the federal government face their commitment to back up their requirement for parent participation with help in terms of money, technical assistanee and visible recognition of what coordination groups have been accomplishing. They must inform the country, and particularly Congress, of the tremendous amounts of coordination that have been occurring shoestring budgets everywhere.

This paper has barely scratched the surface of what's going on in this country on behalf of children through community efforts to mobilize resources for child care. But it is my hope that it is a beginning, a beginning of a national communications network, a beginning of an upgrading of parent/consumer input to those coordinating efforts and community politics, a beginning of a coalition of commitment from the people AND the federal government.

RESEARCH CONTACTS

What follows is a list of communities which were contacted in the course of this research. They are arranged according to city and state but often the full title of the organization includes county names or multi-county designations. In many cases, the person with whom I usually communicated by mail or over the telephone has been added as CONTACT.

I thank all of them for the time, energy, enthusiasm and most of all, optimism, with which they returned materials, answered questions over the phone, and wrote explanations of what their materials contained. Without that assistance this paper could not possibly have been written.

Again I encourage you to contact them for further information about their programs and/or particular projects. And again I ask you to remember that their resources of time, energy and money are just as limited as yours.

ATHENS, GEORGIA

Willie W. Wilker, Executive Director
Athens-Clark 4-C, Inc.
240 South Hull Street
Athens, Georgia 30601
CONTACT: Miss Helen Butler, Assistant Director
404 - 543-6506 (7

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

Ms. Jacqueline Cook, Executive Director
4-C of Metropolitan Atlanta, Inc.
609 Glenn Building, 120 Marietta St., N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
CONTACT: Ms. Pat Tasse, Info. Spec.
404 - 688-8162

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

Mrs. Marjorie Teitlebaum, Executive Secretary
Maryland 4-C Committee
100 No. Eutaw Street, Rm. 601
Baltimore, Md. 21201
CONTACT: Marjorie Teitlebaum
301 - 383-5620

ESCANABA, MICHIGAN

Ms. Shirley Oczus, Chairman
Menominee-Delet-Schoolcraft
4-C Association
Box 378
Escanaba, Michican 49829
CONTACT: Shirley Oczus
906 - 786-7080

HOUSTON, TEXAS

Mr. Raymond Hill, Chairman
4-C Steering Committee
Suite 306 C & I Building
Houston, Texas 77002
CONTACT: George Valdez, Director
713 - 224-1701

MADISON, WISCONSIN

Ms. Grace Frudden, Chairman
Dane County 4-C
1st Congregational Day Care Center
1609 University
Madison, Wisconsin 53705
CONTACT: Aurelia Strupp, Director
614 Western Ave., Madison, Wisconsin
608 - 238-0846

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

Greg Coler, Executive Director
Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association
430 Oak Grove, Suite B10
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403
CONTACT: Sheila Segal, Special Project
Coordinator
612 - 332-5517/332-0581

MISSOULA, MONTANA

Mrs. Mary Patten, Director
Missoula-Mineral Counties 4-C
508 Dole Avenue
Missoula, Montana 59801
CONTACT: Betty Welty, Secretary
406 - 728-3710

PORTLAND, OREGON

Ed Klumpp, Central Administrator
Metropolitan 4-C Council
1630 S. W. Morrison
Portland, Ore. 97201
CONTACT: Mrs. Edie Ryman, Program
Development Coordinator
503 - 222-6406

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

Ms. Betsey McGuire, Coordinator
Seattle-King County 4-C
100 Cockett Street
Seattle, Washington 98310
CONTACT: Betsey McGuire
206 - 283-2555

SPRINGFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS

Ms. Elizabeth Driftmier, Chairman
Springfield 4-C
293 Longhill Street
Springfield, Mass. 01108
CONTACT: Scott Forsyth, Director
403 - 736-4522

WACO, TEXAS

Ms. Marjie Barrett, Executive Director
Greater Waco-McLennan County 4-C
806 Medical Arts Building
Waco, Texas 76704
CONTACT: Marjie Barrett
817 - 752-6537

WHITE PLAINS (WESTCHESTER COUNTY), NEW YORK

Mrs. Inez Singletary, Executive Director
Day Care Council of Westchester, Inc.
129 Court Street
White Plains, New York 10601
CONTACT: Inez Singletary
914 - 761-3456

APPENDIX

GREATER MINNEAPOLIS DAY CARE ASSOCIATION: EARLY HISTORY

Pauline Berryman

This account includes our history through the creation of the Association (the term I will use throughout the paper), its funding, and a little of its sudden expansion. Following the history are descriptions of some of our problems, mistakes, and what I think of as our "great ideas."

It was the fall of 1967. I was the chairman of a Board of Social Concern in my church, seeking to find avenues of service beyond our own congregation. When confronted with the unmet needs of the community, however, I began to see why isolation seemed good. Where does one start? How could we begin to more than touch the surface in the deep pool of troubled water? We cast about, tentatively responding to this and that. One day a priest friend of mine who had much more of a day-to-day relationship with the community, said, "Why don't you start a day care center on the South Side of Minneapolis? Every day people say, 'I need to work, but I have no place for my children.'" I could almost hear his mind working: "Another do-gooder. She'll putter around on this awhile and then be off to something else." I thought he might be right. Me, a musician, working for a day care center? I didn't even know what one was. I was deeply concerned about human rights, but how did this relate?

A few weeks later I took a friend of mine to attend an OEO meeting in which a proposal for three day care centers on the South Side were discussed. It was a briefing for those who had helped in the planning and were now awaiting funding. I told them that churches on the South Side might expand that number to four or five centers by offering space, materials, volunteer help, and some money. I didn't understand the kind but unbelieving looks of the group. "Go ahead and try," they said, somewhat like the pat on the head of a child who offers to catch all the leaves the autumn wind is whirling down.

I knew better what their response meant after I had visited several other church boards. Whether cool, warm, or grinding, each encounter had the same result: no commitment of anything. Not even much encouragement to return. I believe now that my approach was at fault. If I had designed a plan, with a realistic use of what they had best to give (space, materials, volunteer help, and small dollar amounts), my reception would have been different. I think I was expecting church boards to come up with a plan for implementation of my idea. This is not the way most church boards operate.

It was March when we received the word that the OEO proposal would not be funded. I was hardly in a mood to travel the former ground with an even bigger request. A friend of mine called some friends together to hear the story. By this time I had a better picture of what Minneapolis

child care was like. There were 31 centers, mostly private, caring for a few over 600 children. There were more children than that in the summer Headstart program. But children from low-income families were not those cared for in most of the centers, because the rates were an average of $18 per week per child. The largest resource was day care homes, 435 licensed and an undiscovered number unlicensed. In one of these homes a mother might be able to get a rate for two children. And she probably wouldn't have to travel across town, wakening her children in the early hours to feed, dress, and take them on a bus before work. But she couldn't be sure of what her child would encounter in the day care home, because the homes were licensed for generally good physical surroundings and health of the family. Little was said about the attitude of the mother toward the child or what would be happening during the day. Some mothers could not find or afford even this care, and teenagers were pulled out of school or children left alone. A friend of mine had her 9-year-old son coming home from school at noon and after school to check on the younger children, one of whom was a year old. That worked until the 9-year-old was arrested for stealing and setting fires...One infant, left alone during the day for several weeks, died in the arms of a woman sought out by his frantic mother.

The women who listened were there because of their interest in the community. They gave me the names of persons I should call.

The next few months were the beginning of my association with some of the fascinating persons working for the well-being of our community. The first meeting gathered persons who had highly responsible work, but who saw the interrelatedness of child care to the total health of the community. They let me know that they weren't interested in helping to create one child-care center. But they would help to develop a group responsible for coordination and development of child care services in the total area. I heard this, without realizing its full meaning, and felt that I was being side-tracked. It all seemed to be far away from those mothers who needed care now. I remember the kindness of the gallant men from the Community Health and Welfare Council, our city planning office for use of United Funds, when I continued to ask if we couldn't plan for one center along with this more nebulous task. "Well, yes, Pauline, I don't see any reason why we can't plan for a center." He knew what I learned: that the task of conceiving and setting up an organization of the scope we envisioned would take all of our energy for some time.

That was March. In November, 1968, we signed our corporate papers: Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association, a nonprofit corporation to promote good child care in Minneapolis.

By this time, most of the key persons who had helped shape us had disappeared with other demanding responsibilities. They left behind some important gifts: input into the philosophy

we began to evolve; introduction to possible routes to secure funds and support; a beginning knowledge of the way the community functions; why they had come to believe that adequate child care was important; insight into how a workable organization should be organized. They replaced themselves with others who had more time to work through out problems in the long months ahead.

During these months and the ones that followed, our time was consumed with meetings and telephone calls to gather information and support. Social workers, businessmen and women, ministers and their wives, community planners, child development specialists, doctors, philanthropists, AFDC mothers -- the threads led into every part of the city. A kind and competent lawyer gave his time to help us become incorporated and worked on our board for almost four years. Two churches sent money gifts for the center I kept talking about when I spoke to groups. This same concern made us create a committee to talk about program in such a center, and another to find a site. A committee was created to find funds. Another to help educate the public about the situation and need. I began to build a file of persons contacted, for what reason, and their response. Often they gave us other names and the file grew along with my telephone bill. I learned to hold the phone away from my ear while it rang to protect myself during the hours of calling. I thought I appropriately and humorously described myself, when

asked the question, "What is your role with this group?" by answering, "They need a 'call girl' and a 'leg man.'" I misjudged the fact that the person asking the question was a former minister and screening person for 36 foundations!

It seemed impossible that it could take so much time just to create an organization, refine its philosophy, determine some immediate goals, and gain the support to become a functioning entity in the community. But now I value that time as highly creative and well spent. We were learning, sifting, strengthening, building trust in each other and within the community. We tested our plan on anyone who would listen and then returned with their questions and suggestions to further refine our idea. At the center of our thinking was our belief that we could be the most help if we were a resource organization, not an administrative unit, and that we would work for quality child care.

I was spending an increasing amount of time telling people about the need in our city and what we were trying to do about it. And I was asking for money for a staff for our small company. I remember some of those encounters vividly. One gentleman suggested that he might get his wife to volunteer to be our director: "She is bored with staying at home anyway. This might keep her busy a few hours a week." His company didn't have any funds in their foundation or personnel department for a low priority need such as child

care. Others responded with heat, fearing for projects concerned with mental health and drugs and the aged, which were already suffering from lack of funds. My assertion that perhaps they would eventually be saving remedial medicine by spending preventive medicine on good resources for families who needed them did not seem to be acceptable. Very often the same person said that mothers should stay home with their children and that AFDC mothers should get out and work. There was such lack of understanding of the lives of people who have to work to live, even if their children must be cared for by someone else. Or of the possible change of the hopelessness that begins when a child enters school and is not able to learn to read because his experience has not prepared him for this kind of skill learning. I felt that every hour with someone was a learning one, either for me or the other person. I approached public and private companies, foundations, schools, the University of Minnesota, governmental agencies, national and local church organizations, our local United Fund, unions, individuals...everyone we could think of.

A few persons listened carefully, because the things I was saying about employee absenteeism and stopping work were being said within industry itself. The most responsive listeners were the employment task force of the Urban Coalition. These men and women were listening for anything that made employment of unskilled persons difficult. I described the

problems a mother might have with an unreliable baby-sitter, a sick child, or transportation, and how a mother might have to protect herself from revealing that her absenteeism was caused by child care problems because of a statement about having dependable child care in her application form. I suggested that the cost of training a person was greater than usually reckoned, because 1) all of the persons working with a trainee are slowed down by his inefficiency, 2) a supervisor's time is taken, and 3) the trainee does not become fully efficient until some time after his training program is finished. If child care is provided only during the training program, the mother is not earning enough to assume full child care costs immediately following the termination of a training program. Often she does not yet feel competent and excited enough in her work to continue when financial difficulties arise. If she terminates employment, the expense of training has been lost. More important, an opportunity to become independent is surrendered. These people agreed that there is little incentive for a mother on AFDC to work when her costs for transportation, clothing, child care, and other necessities give her less money after spending the full day working. The Urban Coalition task force recommended to their board that our group be given help. A Social Service task force was created, and we spent several months travelling the same ground, with the same result. How this eventually helped will be explained later.

That was in the spring of 1970. Several months before, in the fall of 1969, I had met a leader of the Black community who knew of our effort. This gentleman, Bill English, was the president of the Planning and Policy Committee for the Minneapolis Model Cities Program. He asked why the Association had not presented a child care proposal to their program. I described my frequent calling to the office and being told that it was all taken care of. He said that I had been misinformed, and that I should get a proposal in immediately. The other plans were already in the hands of the city council. They included a "Mini-School" designed as a pilot study for 3-year-old learning, funds for expansion of Headstart in the area, and a resource-sharing center for equipment that centers could not afford.

In November of 1969, the Association presented a plan for Comprehensive Child Care to the Model Cities Planning and Policy Committee. The plan included funds for 1) retaining five centers set up by the Concentrated Employment (training) Program if the rumor proved true that the program would be dropped, 2) two new centers, 3) purchase of service plan for families to be able to use existing centers of a sliding fee scale, and 4) training for staff in existing centers to upgrade quality of the environment for the child and offer a career ladder for child care employees. Because the proposal was beyond funding capacity, and a training component was being written by Metropolitan

Junior College, the training component was dropped. The proposal was accepted by the Planning and Policy Council, sent to the City Council, which suggested it be incorporated with the original child care components. With these changes the program was accepted.

Two things happened that put the Association into actual operation as a funded organization: first, assuming the role of operator of the five centers when the Concentrated Employment Program was dropped, and second, accepting the role of administration for the Model Cities Child Development Program. The unfolding of these two situations, and how it thrust us into a different position within the city is the second stage of our story, and one of the most interesting.

The Model Cities Proposal was still being reviewed in March of 1970 when suddenly the Concentrated Employment Program was cancelled. What would happen to the centers? I called the president of the Urban Coalition and one of the County Commissioners to describe the problem and a possible solution. They asked me to set up a meeting with key persons who might be able to make a determination about continuation of these programs. The purpose of the meeting would be to convince the County Welfare Department that they should open up for use in group programs the Social Security Title IV A funds. The state legislature had passed a bill changing the local share from 80% to 25%, making use of the federal match feasible. Hennepin County has used IV A money for AFDC child

care payments, but had not allowed its wider use. Their fear was that if federal funds were withdrawn, the county would be held responsible for continuing programs it could not assume.

The word had travelled, and many persons to be affected by the decision were present to witness the confrontation with the Welfare Department. The pressure of the need and the obvious available solution resulted in the Welfare Board voting to allow the Social Security Funds to be matched. Private funds were furnished as a local match until the Model City funds could replace them in three months. The Day Care Association was given the task of administering the centers. Without money for staff. How could I have let that happen? This was a good example of something I learned many times: try to think through what will happen and be prepared for the outcome of a meeting: and do not go alone to key meetings. What one does not think of another may. One person is easier to convince than two, and two can be more persuasive. And who knows when you may need a witness?

Our feeling was one of elation, however. We had accomplished what everyone has said for months was impossible: Title IV A funds open for matching! That meant that the Model Cities proposal might be expanded. Little struggling groups could get 25% more easily than 80% of the total cost. It was a high moment!

The second event, assuming the role of administration of the Model Cities Child Development Program, took place with more conflict. Two of the centers had been run for the Concentrated Employment Program by the local OEO Poverty Board. When our organization was proposed as coordinator, staff of the Poverty Board challenged this idea, fearing that we would undo one of their objectives: the hiring of low-income and minority persons in the centers. Our board tried to allay their ungrounded fears about our purpose for staff. The Chairman of the Planning and Policy Committee spoke forcefully for the idea that government funds would not be given to cities without a strong child care coordinating organization. The Association was given the task of coordination.

How the above events catapulted us into becoming a funded agency is slightly humorous. I began to get questions and barbs from the Welfare Department about monitoring the five Model City centers. They felt that we were not doing a very good job of seeing that the programs were run well. We had the same concern. The child development experts attracted to our work had full-time jobs. I was using all of my energy trying to get funds and trying to build support behind the organization. Meanwhile I relied heavily on the county person assigned to monitor the five Model Cities centers. I called in two state licensing consultants to help evaluate the programs and help with submitted budgets. But the programs were left in the hands

of the directors and head teachers. Planning for the implementation of the Model Cities plan was being done by a task force set up by the Association. This was a highly competent group, who designed the specifics of the program, including plans for staff. But that staff was not hired yet. So pressure from Model Cities was added to that of the County. Other responsible persons in the community approached me with the concern that the program continue to be federally funded and responsibly handled.

Searching frantically for a solution, in the face of no response to my search for $30,000 for staff, I suggested the possibility that our staff cost might be acquired through matching IV A funds. A representative from our regional welfare office was consulted to see if these monies could be used for planning. His response was "yes." It was at this moment that the long months spent with the Urban Coalition and the funding organizations proved valuable. We had followed each structure guideline they had given us. The pressure was on us to do a task for which we needed staff. The local foundations had established an Equal Opportunity Fund from which had become the match to keep the CEP centers going. The Coalition supported our funding, and negotiations began. It was not long before I called the chairman of our Personnel Committee to tell her that we had money to cover salary for a director, secretary, office, and supplies for one year. Another high moment!

Our new director, Gregory Coler, was chosen for his dynamic ability to build an organization. From the time that he was hired to the present, almost two years later, the Association has had a growth explosion. It is the prime contractor for federal child care funds in the county. It is the recognized advocate for parental control of child care programs. It has helped to enable the continuation of federal and state resources. With the use of the federal Title IV A funds, 17 centers operate for low-income persons with initial and/or continuing assistance from the Association. Close to 1000 children from low-income families receive care through our help. Some of the services offered are the following: help in writing proposals or budgets; help in securing federal funds for matching help in securing staff training; accounting; insurance; personnel referral; and help in setting up transportation. Floods of calls come for help of all kinds to a heavily over-worked staff. The Executive Director, Assistant Director, accountant, two secretaries, and a suburban organizer are the present staff. We are searching for a child development consultant and a community organizer for Minneapolis.

Four areas of service are in beginning stages: 1) expansion of the purchase of service plan for families to use private centers outside the Model Cities area. Still in limited use, this plan makes available an already-established resource to almost 200 hundred children. The biggest problem is how to

meet federal guidelines. Private owners are excited and upset about the need to have one staff person for four to five children when they may only have a few of these subsidized children. 2) A training program has been started, using local schools. Classes are being held in various parts of the community for child care staff persons to receive credit. Health care classes are also being offered for credit. 3) Part-time programs have finally begun to receive matching funds. After-school care is being included in some programs. 4) A committee watches governmental action that affects the total picture of good care. State Welfare Department efforts to write new standards for centers, the Senate amendment to freeze Social Security funds at the 1969 level, a more liberal child care state bill, and the Mondale Child Care Bill, as well as Nixon's Family Assistance Plan have been under surveillance by this committee. 5) Infant care and sick child care have been set up in a few instances.

Other programs are being discussed such as: 1) a training program for day-care mothers. These homes have been of great concern, and we recognize their high potential for good or crippling care. The County Welfare Department has made some efforts to help train these mothers this year. 2) Tentative steps are being made by the school board to try three and four year old learning programs.

The Association is not totally responsible for all of the above having happened. In fact, the credit should go largely to the groups of concerned persons within local communities wanting better care for their children. But the Association has had a role in this picture being different than it was five years ago. Nor does the above description present more than a diminutive look at the total work of our staff and board. It does not describe the many meetings and the work that goes into helping write a proposal, seeing that it is signed by the necessary agencies, and helping it go into operation. It does not hint at the intricacies of persuasion and understanding that make resources available to those who need them.

At the present time, we are going through a period of evaluation. We believe that we have succeeded in building to the point that we must look at our effectiveness. There are those who say we have been too abrasive of funding agencies and that we should smooth negotiation channels to ensure easier delivery of service. Others say that we have done everything to please the agencies and, in fact, are being controlled by them instead of the parents. The criticism has been made that we are too slow to respond to needs at the local level, that we have actually become an added burden. There are those who say that we should spend a great deal of time working for quality child care, and there are those who say we should spend our time

getting money and support for the care and let the state worry about the quality.

I should like to devote the last part of the paper to some of our problems and mistakes and to what I believe are our most exciting ideas.

I have included some of our problems and some of our mistakes in the historical account. There are a few, however, that I wish to treat separately. The first is our experience with parents and staff of centers involved in funding controversies. The Association is still feeling the repercussions from the troubled time before we assumed administration of the Model Cities centers. During the time of fear over whether funding would be continued, parents and staff of centers were brought into the conflict. Their precarious position made them highly vulnerable and easily upset by rumors, attitudes, pressures to react. The turmoil hurt the child care programs, frightened the staff and parents. Again, when fear of the Association's hiring policy was high before we were chosen to administer the centers, staff and parents were further excited. Things that were said about the Association were based on no facts or effort to understand our real position or the kind of people we were. I am not saying that parents and staff should not know of the conflict or be involved in it. In fact, I think this is valuable experience for them. But not if they

manipulated, do not have the actual facts available to them, or are not allowed to participate in any but the "crisis" meetings, where their emotion is used as a whip to accomplish what their understanding could do better. Some beautiful examples of community strength confronting elected officials have been experienced by the area committees, which I will describe later.

Another problem was how to build the relationship of the elected Model Cities Planning and Policy Committee, its core groups, the parents and staff of centers, and the Association so that the work of the program could be accomplished. The original task force, which planned the individual components of the program, replaced itself with a permanent task force made up of parents being served in the Model Cities centers, representatives from the Planning and Policy Committee, and persons appointed by the Association. Within a few months this task force was immobilized by disagreement over its purpose. The basic problem seems to be a need for control of their projects by Model Cities elected representatives and staff, and the need of the Association, as the contracted administrative body, to be responsible for the program. Model City day care staff persons, hired and directed by our Executive Director, were also being directed by Model City staff. The task force was cut out of the picture. Recently a new task force, made up of parents and persons from the Model Cities Policy and Planning Committee and the Association, worked out a new format

for administrative control. This plan has been passed by the Association board and refused by the Model Cities Committee. The greatest concern of the Association has been the lack of parental input and control, and the fact that the Association has been in the position of actually administering the centers, which is against our policy. Agreement to subcontract with parent and resident boards for each center has not been possible. At present, our staff is trying to be sure that parent advisory boards are active in each center, with area administrative staff responsive to these parent groups. An effort is being made to do our work of helping new centers and new projects get started, while doing a good job of supporting the continuing program. Continuation of funding is the primary need at this point.

One of our major problems has been how to respond to voices from the community. A continual question is why governmental machinery works so slowly to enable the delivery of service and funds. We know that we have a basic philosophical difference, wanting the power to be with those we serve. Turmoil and feelings of accountability make departments overly careful. Lack of understanding of our goals, or disagreement with them, has slowed the process. Now and then someone seems to enjoy power and using fear. Pitted against these forces are those who want a quicker and more adequate response. The Association is supposed to be the advocate for child care. Is this ensured by

negotiation or a show of strength? Or an interplay of both? The question has to be decided one day at a time and takes the best skills of a gambler.

We learned how important it is to have a good accounting system when the state audit found our books in excellent order. Several contracts and probably our continuation as a contractor for IV A funds awaited the outcome of that audit. Good records also proved to be important, since many questions related to a period when the state and county welfare departments were being organized.

Much of our struggle has been to acquire a staff that represents and can relate to the persons we serve. This means minority persons, persons who understand the viewpoint of an AFDC parent, persons with the necessary skills to excite teachers and parents about child development ideas and cultural appreciation. And we have come to believe that having staff to help local communities and groups combine their strength and develop plans to meet their expressed needs is crucial. Community organizing has moved to a high priority.

An early fault in our approach, which the reader probably detected, is more apparent to me in retrospect. It is worth discussing, however, for the sake of other new struggling groups. The fault is that I was doing too much along in our early growing stages. As the needs and requests for help began to be referred to us, we tried to respond where we could.

Every exposure within the day care community meant further understanding for us and further acceptance of our organization. An exclusive zoning law; a group wanting to know how to start a new center; an organization wanting to know about child care needs; a plan for coordinating all women's groups to work for child care -- there were so many. Our board was already working harder than most boards, struggling to build committees to do the most needed tasks, striving to shape our policy with long-range perspective, and working for resources and support from the persons and organizations within their spheres of influence. We were a cooperative group, a committee of the whole, letting the pressure of the situation and our personal motivation dictate the amount of time we gave. I have never been good at pressuring people to do something when they have good reasons not to.

I was working full time trying to help meet the first priority we chose: to get funding for a staff. This search took me to organizations and individuals, telling the story, asking for funds. It began to be easier for persons to carry on negotiations with me because of our previously built understanding. The board and I tried to keep each other aware of every move, and I relied heavily on them for advice, but I began to be the visible figure in the community. I was eventually empowered to sign contracts with board approval and to handle checks for centers.

I may never understand what all of the strong pulls were within myself to work as hard as I did. My guesses include my desire to do a good job, the crying needs I discovered, the ego trip of seeing something I helped to create emerging into what promised to become a great helping vehicle for the community, my enjoyment of selling an idea I believe in. But most might be my discovery of so many exciting and wonderful people in helping roles in the community. Working with them stands out as one of the great experiences of my life.

However, if I knew how, I would not work alone again. Too many risks were involved and too much backtracking was necessary. The board had to depend on my evaluation of what I had experienced. If I had taken someone with me, more persons would have known what I knew and seen what I didn't see. The trust should have been for several of us. Later I had to convince several key persons that we were a hard-working team for which I was the speaking person. Not knowing this weakened the credibility that we were a viable organization. If something had happened to me, too much ground would have had to be recovered. But the worst thing to which we were liable was "group think." With one person's voice and ideas speaking both for and to the organization, we were in great danger of limiting ourselves. The board might have acted differently if I had not been the only one interpreting the picture of my encounters with the downtown influential community. This might also be a danger when a strong director

does all of the interfacing, or where there is not a strong board-staff team.

Also, I think I would not try to convince my board of anything. I would turn over the data-gathering and setting up of alternative solutions to committees whenever possible. Two serious misses in this regard showed my mistake. The first had to do with an experiment to build more effective board and committee action. By the spring of 1970, we had made some major changes in our internal structure. At the suggestion of one of our board members, we sought greater strength by building a coalition. This meant a larger board and new members who did not know our struggles. I worked on the small committee to create the new structure, doing much of the idea-gathering myself. Excited by what I discovered, I worked to have them adopted by the board. I wasn't very clever. My timing was terrible. The fast-growing board was too hard to convince of the worth of the unheard-of structure ideas. Most of this learning, which I still like, was lost to us.

Not long after that, the personnel committee turned in their recommendation. Again, I should have backed up, letting the committee take the questions and conflict. But I was feeling enormous pressure from the Model Cities program and the County Welfare Department to get a director. I was convinced that we had found the person we wanted, and I argued heatedly for his hiring. The board, many of whom were now new to us,

reacted with uneasiness and even rancor. This was difficult ground for the new director to walk on. I believe now that if there is a serious objection, we should take much more time to gather data and consider the action carefully. As long as there are persons not happy with the solution, as a friend said, there probably is insufficient data. Send it back for more work.

The last problem I wish to mention is the size of our board and the function of the Executive Committee. Several factors pushed the size of our board past where we felt it was a workable body, foremost of which was the 4-C idea (Community Coordinated Child Care). Our limit of 25 was raised to 35. Too many decisions had to come before the board, without time to think through the action carefully enough. Consistently I fought the idea of an Executive Committee, believing that this structure takes control away from the board, which itself is too far from too many of those parents. It often packages an idea and presents it, doing enough homework so that the board finds it hard to resist. The large board made the push for this committee strong. But it was not to be a decision-making body. After one year, we have looked at ourselves and seen that it had become what we did not want, if only because we had more information than anyone. The decision was made at the last Executive Committee meeting to always present more than one alternative solution to the board,

with information about each, to allow a more real decision to be reached by the board. Time to think through implementation problems faced by staff, and to give helpful reactions to staff planning, can be an important function of this committee. But I wonder what will happen when the persons now on the board are gone. How can it keep from becoming what executive committees usually are?

To end this account, I should like to describe briefly what I think are our three great ideas: the coalition, the area committees, and our basic philosophy of being a resource organization.

Our plan for a coalition came from a member of our original board who is now the president of the organization, Connie Hudnut. It brought to fruition part of a plan to cordinate women's groups to work for child care. Major groups were invited to have representation on our board. Study, service, ethnic groups: wide divergence of approach was utilized under the common concern for good child care. Many new ideas, mobilization of hundreds of persons for short-term action, education of many more persons within the coalition organizations about child care needs, some of our tasks taken by these groups -- these are some of the great benefits that can be realized through the coalition. Perhaps the greatest benefit is the strength added to our voice when we speak for children's

needs to the funding community. We are no longer speaking for twenty board members. We represent hundreds of persons who have voted to support the Association and its child care program.

Several months after our beginning the coalition, in the fall of 1970, a young man on our board with a B.A. in Philosophy and a Master's Degree in Community Organizing, Rick Present, formed the first area committee. This was an effort to have the planning and control at the local level. Surveying the need, discovering the resources already available, planning for the best use of what is available and for new programs, gathering community support for the child care program of its area: these were to be the tasks of the area committees. They would be committees of our Association, with elected representatives on our board. This first committee was an exciting step. It became a model for the other area committees formed since, and was the first legitimate way we had discovered to fulfill the 4-C guidelines for parent representation on our board, which our community had requested be 51%.

What was more important to me than percentages was the basic philosophy behind the idea. I had experienced for myself and through others the frustrating helplessness of having too much decided for one, outside one's control, even such a deeply personal matter as the care of one's child. I had agreed with Dr. Edward Zigler (then Director of the Office of Child Development) at the Boston convention of the NAEYC in

1970 when he said that the greatest benefit from Headstart may have been the parents' realization that they could affect a change in their lives and in the community. Shedding helplessness in one area makes possible changed attitudes toward other areas of life, he said. This promises more hope for the children than any educational program. Our whole policy had been built around the idea that we would be a resource organization for needed child care services. Pressure had quickly come from many sides for us to control, even run programs. At the present time, five area committees create a year's plan, look over budgets before they come to our Budget and Allocation Committee, help gather funds for local match, share program ideas, and generate support for programs not receiving needed attention. Very important: area committees are generating grounds for ideas, and hotbeds of challenge for anything that seems ineffective or insensitive to the parent or child. The board and staff become enablers in the true sense, making resources available. Coalition groups are also cast in the supportive role, rather than being controlling forces. This idea works toward building a strong board-staff team, with the staff carrying its appropriate role of implementing the will of the board, which represents the total child community. Ideally, that is.

But the ideal is not without significant realization in the present. As I leave the board after five years, I am delighted with the healthy parent participation, the new ideas coming from area committees that we couldn't seem to find before, the challenge to the tentacles of control that continually wind themselves about us, the loud yells for money to go to children and not administration, the insistence on understanding and acting responsibly. Some of the finest people I know are on our board. And perhaps not one of them would see this story the way I tell it. In such difference is our strength!

Resource Bibliography

A Programmatic Approach to Speech & Language Development. Escanaba, Michigan: Menominee-Delta-Schoolcraft 4-C

Child Care Reprints. Washington, D.C.: Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1970

Child Care Reprints - Volume II. Washington, D.C.: Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1971

Community Family Day Care Project. Family Day Care West - A Working Conference. Pasadena, California: Pacific Oaks College, 1972

Curry, Leah J. and Harry A. Rood. Head Start Handbook for Parents. Washington, D.C.: Gryphon House, 1971

Franck, Barbara M., et al. Care For Our Children: A Comprehensive Plan. Seattle, Washington: King County Child Care Coordinating Committee, 1972

Getting it Together. Washington, D.C.: Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1971

Guide to Assessment of Day Care Services and Needs at the Community Level. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, 1971

Iatridis, Demetrius. Child Day Care in an Urban World Report #1: Social Policy Perspectives & Dilemmas. Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts: Institute of Human Science, Boston College, 1972

Martin, Kay L. Planning for Day Care. Unpublished Masters Thesis. University of California, Berkeley, California, 1972.

Morgan, Gwen. An Evaluation of the 4-C Program. Washington, D.C.: Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1972.

Morgan, Gwen. Regulations of Early Childhood Programs. Washington, D.C.: Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1972

Parents and Teachers Together: A Training Manual for Parent Involvement in Head Start Centers. Washington, D.C.: Gryphon House, 1972

Planning for Child Care - 1972 Priorities for Hennepin County. Hennepin County, Minnesota: Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association, 1972

Siedman, Eileen. Day Care in Vermont. Washington, D.C.: Leadership Institute for Community Development, 1972

published by
The Day Care and Child Development Council
of America, Inc.

1401 K St., N.W., Washington, D.C.
(202) 638-2316